Agg4Ah

A Summary of

Reported Estimates of Heritabilities

and of

Genetic and Phenotypic Correlations

For Traits of Chickens

C. S. G.M. F. OF AGRICULTURE PATHORYS FOR SULTURES LICERARY

OCT 30 1969

CURRENT SERIAL RECORDS

Agriculture Handbook No. 363

Agricultural Research Service

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A Summary of

Reported Estimates of Heritabilities

and of

Genetic and Phenotypic Correlations

For Traits of Chickens

Agriculture Handbook No. 363

Agricultural Research Service UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Washington, D.C.

Issued October 1969

Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
Methods of summarization	2
Discussion of summaries	3
Heritability estimates	3
Genetic and phenotypic correlations estimates	
General conclusions	39
References	39
Unpublished materials	49

A Summary of Reported Estimates of Heritabilities and of Genetic and Phenotypic Correlations For Traits of Chickens

By Terry B. Kinney, Jan, assistant director, Animal Husbandry Research Division, Agricultural Research Service

INTRODUCTION

Definitions, methods of estimation, and biases associated with heritability estimates have been presented in considerable detail by Lush (112), Lerner (105), Dickerson (32), Falconer (37), and others. The methods that have been most commonly used to estimate the heritabilities of

- various traits observed in chickens are:

 (1) Phillipse half-sib correlation $[4\hat{\sigma}_{3}^{2}/\hat{\sigma}_{p}^{2}]$,

 (2) Maternal half-sib correlation $[4\hat{\sigma}_{3}^{2}/\hat{\sigma}_{p}^{2}]$,
 - (3) Full-sib correlation $[2 (\hat{\sigma}_s^2 + \hat{\sigma}_d^2)/\hat{\sigma}_p^2],$ (4) Parent-offspring regression [σ̂_{op}/σ̂_{op}], and
 (5) Realized heritability [R/S].

Where:

 $\hat{\sigma}_{s}^{2}$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{d}^{2}$ are the estimated sire and dam components of variance, respectively, $\hat{\sigma}_{\mathbf{p}}^{2}$ is the phenotypic variance, $\hat{\sigma}_{op}$ is the parent-offspring covariance, R is the estimate response to selection, and S is the selection differential.

The estimation methods that have been used by most researchers have been determined by the mating system of the chickens, the trait of interest, or in some cases, unfortunately, the availability of computer programs.

The hierarchal mating system has been the most commonly used method of propagation in poultry breeding studies. Thus, a major part of the heritability estimates reported in the literature have been obtained by methods (1), (2), and (3). Estimates based on any of these three methods will be biased upward if epistatic variance is important. In any case (1) is expected to be less biased than (2) because of the confounding of maternal effects or dominance variance with the dam component of variance in the hierarchal mating structure. Obviously, (3) is expected to be intermediate between (1) and (2) in value and amount of bias.

The least biased heritability estimates and the best estimates of effective heritability are probably obtained from (4) and (5) although (5) has been little used for the estimation of heritability of traits of chickens.

Heritability estimates are of value because they are an estimate of the proportion of phenotypic variance that is additively genetic and thus serves as an indication of the rate of improvement that might be realized by selection. Perhaps more importantly, the estimates are of value in making decisions regarding the type of mating system that will allow the greatest or most rapid improvement, or both. For example, if a trait is highly heritable, the most economical and rapid improvement will likely be made through mass selection. If a trait is lowly heritable, some form of family selection or progeny testing, or both, will likely be more effective than mass selection.

Although heritability estimates permit one to predict the amount of gain expected from a given amount of selection, the accuracy of prediction is a direct function of the accuracy of the heritability estimate. For this reason an estimate of the heritability of a trait in one population of chickens may or may not be a reliable parameter estimate to use for prediction of gain due to selection in a genetically different population. For any trait an average of heritability estimates from many populations is useful only to categorize expected gain in another population as large, medium, or small. Thus, if one is interested in predicting genetic gain in a specific population as accurately as possible, then he must estimate the heritability from the population for which prediction is to be made. It seems apparent that heritability estimates as such are of little value except as they contribute to an average that is itself useful only to categorize heritability as high, low, or medium for various genetic types of populations; for example, light breeds or heavy breeds.

¹ Italic numbers refer to References, page 39.

Early attempts to determine the genetic relationships among traits were restricted by lack of appropriate statistical methods for separating the genetic and environmental portions of phenotypic correlations. In 1943 Hazel (67) developed a method of calculating the genetic correlation among traits. Since that time, many estimates of the genetic correlations among various traits of poultry have been published. Since the genetic correlation is a function of the covariance and respective variances of two traits, it is subject to the same sources of bias mentioned earlier with regard to variance component estimation.

Genetic correlation estimates quantitate the extent to which two traits are controlled by the same genes. The estimates permit one to predict the correlated response of one trait to selection for a different trait. However, as clearly indicated by the work of Bohren, Hill, and Robertson (13), prediction of correlated responses to selection beyond a single generation is likely to be highly inaccurate without some prior knowledge of the magnitude and composition of the genetic covariance. This finding implies that highly accurate estimates of the genetic correlation within a population are necessary to accurately predict correlated responses even for a single generation.

Thus it seems logical to conclude that genetic correlation estimates as such are of little value except as they may be used in the population in which they are estimated.

An average of genetic correlation estimates from different populations is probably of value only as an indicator of the expected genetic correlation between two traits. It should be kept in mind that, depending on the trait, the individual estimates can vary from large negative to large positive in different populations or even within the same population during different generations of selection.

The summaries contained herein will serve as a reasonably complete review of the literature to the present time. It is virtually impossible to summarize all estimates of heritabilities or genetic correlations because many have been published only in theses, progress reports, or other publications that are not readily accessible. A request for references was addressed to at least one researcher at all experiment stations throughout the United States and a number of references were obtained from them. Many of the publications reviewed did not report specific estimates but rather indicated the approximate magnitude of the estimate. These reports were not used.

METHODS OF SUMMARIZATION

The heritability estimates as reported in the literature have been listed by traits in tabular form indicating the method of estimation, the number of sires and dams, the breed or cross, and sex when pertinent. When two or more estimates were obtained by the same method, in the same population, the estimates were averaged unless standard errors were reported. If standard errors were reported, all estimates and the standard errors were tabulated. Reported estimates of genetic and phenotypic correlations were averaged and the average value is presented in tabular form. When pertinent, an average of tabulated values of heritabilities was calculated and included in the tables; for example, average of reported estimates of the heritability of 8-week weight of males.

Heritability estimates are summarized in tables 1, 2, 3, and 4. Genetic and phenotypic correlations are summarized in table 5. Definitions and abbreviations of terms used in the discussion of the summaries and in the tables are as follows:

Trait

Feed consumption.... Pounds of feed consumed.

Feed efficiency...... Pounds of feed per pound of gain.

Trait—Continued Survivor production __ Number of eggs laid by

our in or production 2	ramon or opportune by
	surviving hens.
First n months or	Number of eggs laid in the
days.	first n months or days
aay o.	after sexual maturity
~ 3.5	(usually early fall).
S.M	Sexual maturity.
To December 31 or	Number of eggs laid or
some other time.	rate of production
	from sexual maturity
	to that time.
Annual production	
Annual production	Number of eggs laid in 1 year.
Hen housed produc-	Number of eggs laid by
tion.	all birds housed.
Egg mass	Total weight of eggs.
Early egg weight	Egg weight taken dur-
• 66 6	ing the first 2 to 3
	months of lay.
34 4 11	
Mature egg weight	Egg weight taken after
	3 months of lay.
Hen day production	Production estimate
J 1	based on number of
	hen days.
TTT	
LH	Leuteotropic hormone.
FSH	Follicle stimulating
	hormone.

AAC	Australorp. Athens Canadian randombred. Athens randombred.	's	Denotes plural; for example, WL's means White Leghorn lines. Indicates an unselected
BL	Brown Leghorn.		line.
BlC	Black Castelana.	(in stub column	Indicates breed or cross
BR	Barred Rock.	of table).	not reported.
C	Combined sexes.	— (in field of	Indicates no data
Cross	Undesignated cross.	table).	available.
<u>D</u>	Durham.	·	
F	Fayoumi.	Heri	tability
G	Gatinaise.	C	Defense to entire attended to
Heavy	Undesignated heavy breed.	S	Refers to estimation by paternal half-sib
Inbred	A strain specified as		correlation.
Indica	inbred.	D	Refers to estimation by
J	Jungle fowl.		maternal half-sib
Light	Undesignated light		correlation.
	weight breed.	S+D	Refers to estimation by
Mix	Several strains or breeds.	_	full-sib correlation.
Nag	Nagoya.	b _{op}	
NH	New Hampshire.		parent-offspring
Ot	Ottawa control.	D 1	regression.
RIR	Rhode Island Red.	Real	
S	Sussex.		heritability.
SO	Silver Oklabar.	Dogra	e of Freedom
Syn	Synthetic line.	Degre	e of Freedom
WC	White Cornish.	S	Refers to approximate
WG	White Gold.		degrees of freedom
WL	White Leghorn.	_	for sires.
WR	White Rock.	D	Refers to approximate
WW	White Wyandotte.		degrees of freedom
X's	Refers to crosses; for example, WLX's means	Ref	for dams. Refers to the number
	several White Leghorn	161	of the reference in
	crosses.		the list of references.
	C1 000000		one has or references.

DISCUSSION OF SUMMARIES

Heritability Estimates

Breed

Table 1 is a summary of reported heritability estimates of body weight, weight gain, feed consumption, feed efficiency, conformation, market

quality traits, and pigmentation.

There are few reported estimates of the heritability of body weight before 4 weeks of age. Although there is wide variation in some of the individual reports, the averages of estimates indicate that if there are any differences in the heritability of body weight at 4 weeks of age or later, they are small. There is no strong evidence for a difference in sexes or in light and heavy breeds as far as the magnitude of the heritability is concerned. There is, however, a strong indication of either maternal or dominance effects, or both, up to maturity. The presence of either or both of these effects is evidenced by the rather consistently higher average estimates from the maternal halfsib correlations as opposed to paternal half-sib correlations for body weights before pullet age. Although some individual estimates indicate the possible existence of either important maternal or dominance effects, or both, for pullet and mature body weights, the averages of estimates indicate no importance of these effects.

Breed—Continued

Weight gain heritability appears to be similar in magnitude to body weight heritability (0.35 to 0.53) based on averages of three reports. Estimates by a single investigator indicate that feed consumption is highly heritable (greater than 0.50). The heritability of feed efficiency is much lower (0.39 or less). The heritability of feathering traits, breast angle, body depth, keel length, dressing percent, and shank pigmentation apparently fall within the approximate range of 0.25

to 0.40. Heritability estimates of shank diameter and weight/shank length, based on a single report, are about 0.60 and 0.50, respectively

are about 0.60 and 0.50, respectively.

Table 1 summaries indicate that there have been sufficient reports of the heritability of body weights from 4 weeks of age through maturity to

provide a reasonable expectation for this parameter. For all other traits reported in table 1 there are too few reports to serve as reliable estimates of the heritabilities, but these traits all appear to be quite highly heritable (in the approximate range of 0.25 to 0.60).

Table 1.—Reported heritability estimates of body weight, weight gain, feed consumption, feed efficiency, conformation, market quality traits, and pigmentation, by age, breed, and sex of chickens

Trait, age, and breed of	Sex				ree of edom	Ref.			
chicken		s	D	S+D	b _{op}	Real.	S	D	•
BODY WEIGHT									
2-week embryo: Meat cross		0. 18		_			40	320	20
2 weeks: NH NH		. 05 . 01	=	0. 40 . 44			8 8	66 66	31 31
3 weeks: RIR	\mathbf{C}			. 31			24	71	126
4 weeks: WL	৽৻৽৻৽৻৽৻৽৻৽	$\begin{array}{c} \cdot 29 \pm \cdot 63 \\ \cdot 21 \pm \cdot 44 \\ \hline - \\ \cdot 75 \\ \cdot 58 \\ \cdot 54 \\ \cdot 19 \\ \cdot 20 \\ \cdot 66 \end{array}$	0. 74 . 45 . 32 . 72 . 81	. 47 . 43 		= = = = = = = =	40 40 64 32 56 25 25 45 45	600 600 380 192 218 125 125 400 400	10 167 168 188 48 48 138 138
Average		. 43	. 61	. 45					
WR	9 9 9 9 9	. 53 . 19 . 35 . 31 . 20 . 25	. 96 . 98 1. 01 . 81 . 99	. 47 . 53 	= = = = = =		64 32 56 25 25 45 45	380 192 218 125 125 400 400	167 168 183 43 43 138 138
Average		. 31	. 95	. 50				· —	
6 weeks:	ত িত ত	. 09 . 50 . 39±. 07 . 24 . 28	$.83$ $.92\pm.07$ $.72$ $.78$	32 	0. 51±. 03		$\begin{array}{c} 8\\ 56\\ 395\\ 240\\ 45\\ 45 \end{array}$	66 218 1, 128 675 400 400	36 183 129 130 138
Average		. 30	. 81	. 53	. 51				
NH	ф Ф Ф	. 65 . 18 . 46±. 07 . 36 . 27	1. 02 . 61±. 08 . 65 . 84	. 32	. 45±. 03 		56 8 395 240 45 45	218 . 66 1, 128 675 400 400	183 36 129 136 138 138
Average		. 38	. 78	. 48	. 45				

Table 1.—Reported heritability estimates of body weight, weight gain, feed consumption, feed efficiency, conformation, market quality traits, and pigmentation, by age, breed, and sex of chickens—Continued

Trait, age, and breed of	Sex		Heri	tability estin	nate			gree of eedom	Ref.
chicken		S	D	S+D	bop	Real.	s	D	-
BODY WEIGHT—Con.									
6 weeks—Continued									
NH	ç	. 51	. 98				56	218	183
RIR		$-\frac{1}{40\pm .05}$	$.\overline{72}\pm.05$. 29	$.46 \pm .02$	_	$\begin{array}{c} 24 \\ 395 \end{array}$	71 1, 128	126 129
Average	-	. 46	. 85	. 29	. 46				
9		. 40	. 00	. 49	. 40				
8 weeks: WR	♂¹			. 75					g
WR	ď			. 63					ğ
WR	₫				-	0. 31	32	192	164
WR.	o ^r	. 64	. 34	. 49			36	161	171
WR	σ' ~7	. 29	. 60	. 44 . 26	. 22	. 30	64 64	$\frac{380}{380}$	165 167
WR	ď			. 20		. 31	32	192	168
NH	ď	.25	. 13		$.35 \pm .09$		25	125	48
NH	ď	. 01	. 5 4		. $05\pm$. 22		25	125	43
NH		. 07		. 32			8	66	35
NHNH	ر ا	$egin{array}{c} .26 \ .28 \end{array}$. 34 . 15				$\frac{106}{106}$		53 53
NH	S. O.	. 55	. 86				56	218	183
Syn		$.11 \pm .01$	$1.07 \pm .25$	$.63 \pm .10$			109	756	41
Syn	ď	. 48	. 52						52
Syn	♂	. 36	. 25						52
Syn		$.24 \pm .07$			$.37 \pm .04$		115	450	97
Syn		$36 \pm .08$		<u> </u>	$.33 \pm .03$		120	405	97
Syn DXNH		. 39 . 20	$\begin{array}{c} .52 \\ .65 \end{array}$. 45			$\begin{array}{c} 44 \\ 45 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 428 \\ 400 \end{array}$	202 138
DXNH	₹	. 65	. 57				45	400	138
Mix.	ď	. 69							74
	ď	. 47	. 85				160	160	83
	♂	. 32	. 16				160	160	83
	♂ _	. 88					20	164	15
Average		. 38	. 50	. 50	. 26	. 31			
WL	φ -	$.52 \pm .05$					188	728	203
WL	φ	$.26 \pm .31$	$.69 \pm .39$				100	500	207
WL	Ŷ.	$.48\pm.09$ $.43\pm.10$	-				$\begin{array}{c} 684 \\ 684 \end{array}$	2, 364 2, 364	$\frac{96}{96}$
WL	ŏ	$.66\pm .93$			_		40	600	$\frac{90}{9}$
WL	φ	$.41 \pm .68$	-				40	600	g
WL	Ϋ́	. 29	. 69				300	1, 500	94
WL*	φ	. 22	. 35				60	260	186
WR	Ŷ.			. 10					153
WR's	Ŷ Ŷ			$\substack{.82\\.42}$			$\frac{-}{71}$	318	10 205
WR.	Ŷ Ŏ	$. \frac{-}{12}$. 58	. 35	. 36	. 27	64	380	165
WR	φ	. 12	. 00	. 63					10
WR	ģ			. 14			64	380	167
<u>WR</u>	φ					. 27	32	192	168
WW.	Ŷ	$.25 \pm .09$	$.77 \pm .10$	$.~51\pm.~12$			46	232	62
NH	Ý	. 21	. 36				$egin{array}{c} 8 \ 25 \end{array}$	66 125	35 19
NH	Ý O	. 06 . 16	. 95 . 03		$.65\pm.14\ .23\pm.12$		$\frac{25}{25}$	$\begin{array}{c} 125 \\ 125 \end{array}$	43 43
NH	φ	. 10		. 33	. 20 12		9	48	79
NH	$\dot{\Phi}$. 35	. 63	_			128	_	53
NH	ģ	. 15	. 63				128		53
NH	ç	. 88	. 69				56	218	183
RIR	φ	$.34 \pm .55$	$.28 \pm .66$				100	500	207
RIR*	Q	$.\ 50 \pm .\ 09$					273	1,825	95
	Ť			99					79.0
BRSyn	o	$\frac{-1}{15\pm .04}$. 69±. 13	$33 \\ 39 \pm .05$			$\begin{array}{c} 18 \\ 109 \end{array}$	85 769	79 41

Table 1.—Reported heritability estimates of body weight, weight gain, feed consumption, feed efficiency, conformation, market quality traits, and pigmentation, by age, breed, and sex of chickens—Continued

Trait, age, and breed of Sex		Her	itability esti	mate			ee of	Ref.
chicken	$\overline{\mathbf{s}}$	D	S+D	b _{op}	Real.	s	D	•
BODY WEIGHT-Con.							•	
8 weeks—Continued Syn Syn Syn Syn	37 $24 \pm .06$ $31 \pm .09$. 53 — —	. <u>42</u> —	$\begin{array}{c} \\ .\ 33\pm .\ 04 \\ .\ 22\pm .\ 04 \end{array}$		$\frac{44}{110}$	428 440 360	202 97 97
Mix ♀ Mix ♀ Mix ♀ DXNH ♀	. 51 		. 46	. 31		193 159 45	980 609 400	74 117 197 138
DXNH	$.68$ $.95\pm.34$ $.20\pm.34$ $.55$	$.94$ $.64\pm .35$ $.89\pm .40$				$\begin{array}{c} 45 \\ 100 \\ 100 \\ 20 \end{array}$	400 500 500 164	138 207 207 15
Average —	. 39	. 61	. 42	. 36	. 27			
F	. 67 . 21 	. 84 . 58 . —	. 76 . 39 . 20 . 34	. 29	. 29	70 64 64 —	488 380 380	5 165 167 34 122 122
NH	. 64	. 85	1. 25			$\begin{array}{c} 56 \\ 59 \\ 220 \end{array}$	$218 \\ 457 \\ 220$	183 45 176
Average —	. 45	. 76	. 59	. 29	. 29		-	
9 weeks: WR	$\begin{array}{c} -17 \\ \cdot 16 \\ \hline \cdot 40 \pm \cdot 06 \\ \cdot 54 \\ \cdot 63 \end{array}$	-45 $\cdot 55$ $-81 \pm \cdot 08$ $\cdot 72$ $\cdot 49$. 63 . 31 . 35 . 73 . 63 . 56	$\begin{array}{c}\\ .35\pm.17\\ .28\pm.04\\\\ .56\pm.03\\ .49\pm.17\\ .20\pm.08 \end{array}$		50 12 15 240 395 14 10	109 120 156 675 1, 128 110 98	172 48 51 130 129 48 51
Average —	. 38	. 60	. 54	. 38				
NH	. 13 . 23 . 44±. 06 . 38 . 56	. 96 . 65 . 49 ±. 07 . 45 . 42	. 54 . 44 . 58 	$\begin{array}{c} .55 \pm .13 \\ .36 \pm .04 \\$		12 15 240 395 14 10	120 158 675 1, 128 110 96	48 51 130 129 48 51
Average —	. 35	. 59	. 49	. 41			-	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$. 28 . 28 . 08 . 40±. 05 . 30 . 41	. 65 . 52 . 74 . 62±. 05 . 51 . 80	. 48 . 40 . 41 . 27 . 41 . 60	$\begin{array}{c} .\ 22\pm.\ 04 \\ .\ 49\pm.\ 03 \\ .\ 34\pm.\ 03 \\ \hline \\ .\ 52\pm.\ 02 \\ .\ 34\pm.\ 03 \\ .\ 50\pm.\ 06 \end{array}$		10 12 12 24 395 8	129 131 140 71 1, 128 87 67	51 51 51 126 129 51 51
NH C	. 45	. 51	. 48	$37 \pm .05$		<u>9</u>	86	51
Average	. 31	. 62	. 44	. 40				
10 weeks: WW	. 36 . 24 . 94	. 91	. 63 . 47 . 46			8 8 56	545 66 218	206 35 183 101
Average	. 51	. 76	. 52	. 33				

Table 1.—Reported heritability estimates of body weight, weight gain, feed consumption, feed efficiency, conformation, market quality traits, and pigmentation, by age, breed, and sex of chickens—Continued

Trait, age, and breed of chicken	Sex	Heritability estimate					Deg fre	Ref.	
cnicken		S	D	S+D	b _{op}	Real.	S	D	-
BODY WEIGHT—Con.									
0 weeks—Continued									
NH		. 09 . 4 5	. 78	. 33		_	8 56	$\begin{array}{c} 66 \\ 218 \end{array}$	38 188
Average	_	. 27	. 78	. 33					
NH		. 62	. 29				10	100	2.
NH	\mathbf{C}	. 56	. 29 . 81	. 45			56	$\frac{100}{218}$	18
RIR	$^{\rm C}$. 29		. 38	$.15\pm.08$		18	140	14
SONHXSO	C	. 50 . 45	. 17	. 34			$\begin{array}{c} 10 \\ 82 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 100 \\ 440 \end{array}$	2 1
NHXSO	\mathbf{C}	. 65	. 31	. 48	-		10	100	2
SOXNH	\mathbf{C}	. 69	. 35	. 52			10	100	2
Average		. 54	. 39	. 43	. 15				_
2 weeks:	0	49 10	57 L 00	50			105	200	2
WL	φ φ	$.43\pm.10$ $.73\pm.13$	$.57 \pm .08$ $.58 \pm .09$. 50 . 66	_		$\begin{array}{c} 105 \\ 105 \end{array}$	$\frac{300}{300}$	z 2
WL	φ					. 44	80	305	3
WL	Ф О				. 35				15
B1C		_	_	_	. 34 . 54				15. 15.
Average	•	. 58	. 58	. 58	. 41	. 44			
NH		. 38					8	85	
NH	\ddot{c}	. 42	. 60	. 51		_	8	$\frac{35}{29}$	10
RIR	\mathbf{C}	-		. 31			24	71	12
80	C				-	$34 \pm .03$	160	1, 150	12.
80				_	_	$\begin{array}{c} .\ 07\pm .\ 05 \\ .\ 45\pm .\ 03 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 160 \\ 240 \end{array}$	1, 150 1, 725	12 12
ŠO		4				$.17\pm .05$	240	1, 725	12
Average		. 40	. 60	. 41	_	. 26			
weeks: Heavy Cross				. 47			192	192	176
weeks: Ot* weeks:	o¹			. 61			240	675	130
Heavy Cross Pullet (light):	\mathbf{C}	_		. 52			144	144	176
WL		$.67 \pm .03$					436	1, 897	20
WL		$.40 \pm .09$	$.57 \pm .08$. 48	_		105	300	2
$egin{array}{c} \mathrm{WL} \\ \mathrm{WL} \end{array}$	o O	$.69\pm.13$ $.28\pm.08$	$\begin{array}{c} .\ 56\pm .\ 09 \\ .\ 64\pm .\ 09 \end{array}$. 63 . 46		_	$\begin{array}{c} 105 \\ 105 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 300 \\ 300 \end{array}$	2: 2:
WL	P	$.28\pm .08$ $.74\pm .13$	$.04\pm .09$. 65			105	300	2
WL	ģ			$.48 \pm .06$			230	2, 270	40
WL_	Q O	20				$.43\pm.04$	115	1, 135	40
WL* WL*	ó	. 32 . 48	. 52 . 89	_			$\frac{168}{300}$	559 1, 500	$rac{6}{9}$
WL*	φ	$.86 \pm .11$. 				340	1, 200	90
WL*	φ	$.41 \pm .09$					340	1,200	90
WLX's	Ŷ Ŏ	$.86\pm .34$.29	. 17±. 38	. 41			$\begin{array}{c} 100 \\ 464 \end{array}$	$500 \\ 3,036$	207 31
WLX's	φ̈́	. 61		. 43			501	4, 769	78
BL	Ŷ	$.37 \pm .09$	$.34 \pm .14$				65	660	68
BLXS SXBL	Ý	$.71\pm .13$	$\cdot45\!\pm\!.12\ .74\!\pm\!.13$	_			$\begin{array}{c} 65 \\ 65 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 660 \\ 660 \end{array}$	68 68
WLXRIR	Ψ Q	$.55\pm .12$ $.69\pm .31$	$.06\pm.30$		_		100	500	207
RIRXWL	ģ	$.78 \pm .32$	30 ± 34				100	500	207
Mix Mix	<u>Ф</u>	_	_	. 31 . 43	$.18 \\ .32$		159	609	$\frac{197}{101}$
				. ===					

Table 1.—Reported heritability estimates of body weight, weight gain, feed consumption, feed efficiency, conformation, market quality traits, and pigmentation, by age, breed, and sex of chickens—Continued

Trait, age, and breed of	Sex		Herit	ability estim	ate			ree of edom	Ref.
chicken		S	D	S+D	b _{op}	Real.	S	D	•
BODY WEIGHT-Con.									
weeks—Continued Pullet (heavy):									
WR	- 9		*******			. 41	64	384	
WR.	- 오	-		. 44		-	64	380	1
WR	- ¥			. 43 . 46			$\begin{array}{c} 64 \\ 32 \end{array}$	380 192	1 1
WR	φ		-	. 38		. 41	64	384	
NH	_ Ω	. 35	. 47	. 41	$.34 \pm .04$		10	129	
NH	- P	. 51	. 21	. 36	$.39 \pm .04$		12	131	
NH	- 8	. 47	. 59	. 53	$33 \pm .06$		$\frac{12}{15}$	140	
NHRIR		$.58 \\ .68 \pm .08$. 27	. 39	. 40±. 04		$\begin{array}{c} 15 \\ 547 \end{array}$	158 3, 138	
RIR		. 85		. 71	$.\overline{72} \pm .11$		18	140	1
RIR		$.63 \pm .04$	$.35 \pm .41$				$1\widetilde{0}\widetilde{0}$	500	2
WW		$.52\pm .13$	$.70\pm .10$	$.61 \pm .07$			46	232	
SO	- P	. 43	. 90	. 67	$.46 \pm .04$		8	87	
SO		. 34	. 81	. 58	$.43 \pm .08$		8	67	
SO		. 57 . 45	. 41 . 59	. 49 . 52	$.47\pm .04 \\ .40\pm .04$		$\frac{9}{10}$	86 96	
Ot*	- ¥	. 40	. 59	. 64	.40 ± . 04		240	675	j
SXS		$.55 \!\pm\! .11$. $82\pm$. 12				$\tilde{65}$	660	-
Average		. 53	. 56	. 51	. 44	. 41			
Mature (light):									
WL	- P	$.82 \pm .03$					436	1, 897	2
WL	- 9	$.29 \pm .09$	$.64 \pm .09$. 49		_	105	300	
WL WL	- X	$. 67 \pm . 12 \ . 25 \pm . 08$	$\begin{array}{c} .\ 57\pm .\ 19 \\ .\ 62\pm .\ 09 \end{array}$	$62 \\ 43$			$\frac{105}{105}$	$\frac{300}{300}$	
WL	- Ŧ	$.63\pm .12$	$.54 \pm .09$. 58			105	300	
WL	- ¢	. 61					36	190	
WL	<u> </u>	. 52					36	380	
<u>W</u> L	<u> </u>	$.47 \pm .18$	$.80 \pm .16$	$.63 \pm .10$			20	179	
WL		$.93 \pm .29$	$.69 \pm .15$	$.81 \pm .12$			18	156	
WL	- ¥	$.73 \pm .23$ $.57 \pm .28$	$\begin{array}{c} .48 \pm .11 \\ .69 \pm .18 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} .\ 60\pm .\ 11 \\ .\ 63\pm .\ 13 \end{array}$			$\begin{array}{c} 18 \\ 10 \end{array}$	180 108	
WL*	- ¥	. 62 ± . 28	. 09至. 18 . 74	. 05 ± . 15		_	104	365	
WL*	- ¢	. 44	.76				300	1, 500	
WL*	- 9	$.85 \pm .11$					340	1, 200	
WL*	- 2	$.41 \pm .09$					340	1, 200	
WL	- ¥	. 17	-	. 47		. 80	42	218	
$egin{array}{c} WL_{} \ WL_{} \end{array}$	- X	. 29				. 53	140	1, 400	
WL	- ¥			$.64 \pm .02$. 55	85	404	
WL	_ Ω	$.57 \pm .31$	$.32 \pm .37$				100	500	,
WL	_ Ý	$.25\pm .08$	$.58 \pm .06$	$.41 \pm .08$			245	994	
WL*	_ Ω	. 43	. 73				60	260	
F	- £			$.53 \pm .04$			79	301	
WLX's WLX's	- ¥	. 65	_	. 36 . 44			501	4, 769	
Inbreds		. 00		. 44	. 75		98	751	
WLXA	_ Ý	. 20	. 56	-			19	152	
WLXRIR	- Ý	$.78 \pm .32$	$.30 \pm .34$				100	500	;
RIRXWL		$.03 \pm .33$	$.68 \pm .43$				100	500	2
Mix	- Ŷ	. 81	. 39	. 69	. 45		25	278	
Average		. 52	. 59	. 56	. 60	. 67			

Table 1.—Reported heritability estimates of body weight, weight gain, feed consumption, feed efficiency, conformation, market quality traits, and pigmentation, by age, breed, and sex of chickens—Continued

Trait, age, and breed of chicken	\mathbf{Sex}	Heritability estimate						Degree of freedom		
cnicken		s	D	S+D	bop	Real.	s	D	-	
BODY WEIGHT-Con.										
24 weeks—Continued Mature (heavy): WR	O+O+O+O+O+O+O+O+O+O+O+O+O+O+O+O+O+O+O+	$\begin{array}{c} -\\ -\\ -\\ -\\ -\\ -\\ -\\ -\\ -\\ -\\ -\\ -\\ -\\ $	$\begin{array}{c}$. 38 . 36 . 50 . 62±. 07 	. 58	. 49	32 64 108 ———————————————————————————————————	192 384 237 245 2, 797 500 194 675 457 481 609 769	168 80 89 88 95 207 8 88 130 45 72 197 41	
Syn	ў -	. 35 . 35	. 63	. 57	. 67		19	243	72	
Average	. —	. 49	. 52	. 56	. 59	. 49				
WEIGHT GAIN	•									
0 to 3 weeks: WL	0+0+0+0+0+0	. 01 . 14 . 00 . 15 . 90 . 61 . 64	. 65 . 03 05 . 18 . 80 . 66			- - - - - -	4 4 4 56 — 56 56	40 40 40 218 — 218 218	44 44 44 183 74 183	
Average		. 35	. 42			_				
4 to 6 weeks: NH 4 to 8 weeks: Mix 6 to 8 weeks: NH 8 to 10 weeks: NH	ō¹ ō¹	. 52 . 66 . 50 . 09	. <u>97</u> 1. <u>51</u> . <u>98</u>			=	56 56 56	218 218 218	183 74 183 183	
Average		. 44	1. 13			_				
4 to 6 weeks: NH 6 to 8 weeks: NH 8 to 10 weeks: NH	\mathbf{C}	. 65 . 52 . 42	. 75 . 79 . 51				56 56 56	218 218 218	183 183 183	
Average		. 53	. 68							
FEED CONSUMPTION 4 to 6 weeks: NH		. 75					56 56	218 218	183 183	
6 to 8 weeks: NH 8 to 10 weeks: NH		. 85 . 53				_	$\frac{56}{56}$	$\frac{218}{218}$	183	
Average		. 73								

Table 1.—Reported heritability estimates of body weight, weight gain, feed consumption, feed efficiency, conformation, market quality traits, and pigmentation, by age, breed, and sex of chickens—Continued

Trait, age, and breed of	Sex		He	ritability esti	mate			ree of dom	Ref.
chicken		S	D	S+D	b _{op}	Real.	S	D	
FEED CONSUMP- TION—Continued									
4 to 6 weeks: NH 6 to 8 weeks: NH 8 to 10 weeks: NH	·- P	. 76 . 90 . 95	<u> </u>			_	56 56 56	218 218 218	183 183 183
Average		. 87	_	_	_			!-	
4 to 6 weeks: NH 6 to 8 weeks: NH 8 to 10 weeks: NH	C	. 73 . 76 . 60	. 63 . 70 . 44		<u> </u>	<u>_</u>	56 56 56	218 218 218	183 183 183
Average		. 70	. 59			_			
FEED EFFICIENCY									
4 to 6 weeks: NH 6 to 8 weeks: NH 8 to 10 weeks: NH	o ⁷	. 32 . 06 . 05	<u>-</u>				56 56 56	218 218 218	183 183 183
Average		. 14	_		_				
4 to 6 weeks: NH 6 to 8 weeks: NH 8 to 10 weeks: NH	_ Ŷ ·	. 65 05 . 26	_			=	56 56 56	218 218 218	183 183 183
Average	_ —	. 29		-					
1 to 7 days: WC	C C C C	. 66 . 19 . 14 . 32 . 25 . 48 . 03 . 11	. 37 . 46 . 35				16 16 16 16 16 56 56 56	96 96 96 96 218 218 218	119 119 119 119 119 183 183
Average		. 27	. 39		_				
FEATHERING									
8 weeks: WR	♂ ♂ ♂ ♂		 	. 38	. 35 . 34 . 48 . 58 . 43 . 25		32 — — — — —	192	168 170 170 170 170 170
Average			_	. 38	. 41	_			
8 weeks: WR	O+ O+ O+ O+ O+	——————————————————————————————————————	 	. 30	. 46 . 29 . 50 . 20 . 51 . 39		32	192	168 170 170 170 170 170
Average				. 30	. 39				

Table 1.—Reported heritability estimates of body weight, weight gain, feed consumption, feed efficiency, conformation, market quality traits, and pigmentation, by age, breed, and sex of chickens—Continued

Trait, age, and breed of	Sex		Н	eritability esti	mate			ee of	Ref.
chicken		S	D	S+D	b _{op}	Real.	s	D	
FEATHERING—Continued									
10 days: NH 8 weeks: WR 8 weeks: BR 8 weeks: NH 8 to 12 weeks: NH Breast (broiler): WR Breast (broiler): WR	. C . C . C	. 50	. 38	. 36 . 34 . 42 . 33 . 16 . 44	. 06		$ \begin{array}{r} $	$ \begin{array}{r} \hline 192 \\ 85 \\ 48 \\ \hline 30 \\ 30 \end{array} $	34 168 79 79 34 58 58
Average		. 26	. 19	. 29	. 13				-
BREAST WIDTH									
8 to 12 weeks: NH12 weeks:	- C			. 21	. 12				34
NHNH		. 20 . 13	. 29	$\frac{1}{21}$		_	8 8	$\begin{array}{c} 85 \\ 29 \end{array}$	$\frac{3}{106}$
Average		. 17	. 29	. 21	. 12				
BREAST ANGLE									
8 weeks: WR	- ♂ - ♂	. 48 . 30 . 30	. 32 . 39 —	. 40 . 34 —	. 26	. 31	36 64 32 20	161 380 192 164	171 166 164 15
SO	- ਠੀ - ਨੀ	. 59 . 20 —	. 37 . 62 	$\begin{array}{c} .48 \\ .41 \\ \\ .45 \end{array}$	$34\pm.11$ $37\pm.10$ $45\pm.03$		$14 \\ 12 \\ 395 \\ 240$	$110 \\ 120 \\ 1, 128 \\ 675$	48 48 129 130
Average		. 39	. 43	. 42	. 36	. 28			-
8 weeks: WR WR 9 weeks:	- Ŷ	. 23	. 35	. 30	. 20	. 31 . 21	64 32 20	380 192 164	166 164 15
9 weeks. SO	- Ŷ - Ŷ	. 50 . 48 	. 22 . 66 	$. \frac{36}{.57} - \frac{.45}{.45}$	$egin{array}{l} .\ 42\pm .\ 11 \\ .\ 50\pm .\ 11 \\ .\ 40\pm .\ 03 \\ \hline \end{array}$		$\begin{array}{c} 14 \\ 12 \\ 395 \\ 240 \end{array}$	110 120 1, 128 675	48 48 129 130
Average		. 40	. 41	. 42	. 38	. 26			
8 weeks: WR 9 weeks: Ot* 10 weeks:	- C	. 26	. 37	. 32 . 43±. 02	. 23	. 31	64 395	380 1, 128	166 129
SO Mix NH NHXSO SOXNH	- C - C - C	. 10 . 46 . 35 . 68 . 34	$\begin{array}{c} \cdot 79 \\ \hline \cdot 60 \\ \cdot 37 \\ \cdot 47 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} \cdot 44 \\ - \\ \cdot 47 \\ \cdot 52 \\ \cdot 40 \end{array}$			10 82 10 10 10	100 440 100 100 100	21 19 21 21 21
12 weeks: NH NH		. 38 . 50	. 48	. 49	_	_	8 8	$\begin{array}{c} 85 \\ 29 \end{array}$	3 106
Average		. 38	. 51	. 44	. 23	. 31			

Table 1.—Reported heritability estimates of body weight, weight gain, feed consumption, feed efficiency, conformation, market quality traits, and pigmentation, by age, breed, and sex of chickens—Continued

Trait, age, and breed of	Sex		${ m H}\epsilon$	eritability esti	mate			ree of edom	Ref.
chicken		s	D	S+D	b _{op}	Real.	s	D	•
BODY DEPTH									
10 weeks:	_								
NHNH		$\begin{array}{c} .\ 16 \\ .\ 22 \end{array}$	_	. 35 . 55		_	8 8	66 66	35 35
Average	—	. 19		. 45				:-	
KEEL LENGTH					-				
8 weeks: ————————————————————————————————————	o ⁷¹	. 59	_		. 56±. 03		20	164	15
10 weeks: NH	o ⁷	. 27		$\overline{.52}$. 50 ± . 03	_	$\begin{array}{c} 395 \\ 8 \end{array}$	1, 128 66	1 <i>29</i> 35
44 weeks: Ot*		5.6		. 55			240	675	130
8 weeks: ————————————————————————————————————	Ω	. 56			$.\overline{56} \pm .03$		$\begin{array}{c} 20 \\ 395 \end{array}$	164 1, 128	17 129
10 weeks: NH	. <u> </u>	. 35		. 47			8	66	35
44 weeks: Ot* 8 to 12 weeks: NH				. 52 . 49	. 48		240	675	130 34
9 weeks: Ot*	č		-	_	$.56 \pm .02$		395	1, 128	129
12 weeks: NHNH	C	. 55 . 50	. 17	. 34			8 8	85 29	3 106
Average	—	. 47	. 17	. 48	. 54			<u> </u>	
SHANK LENGTH									
9 weeks: Ot*		*****			$.50 \pm .03$		395	1, 128	129
10 weeks: NH		. 04		. 29		_	8	66	35
44 weeks: Ot*	ç,			. 62	$.45 \pm .03$		$\begin{array}{c} 240 \\ 395 \end{array}$	$675 \\ 1, 128$	130 129
9 weeks: Ot* 10 weeks: NH Mature:	- •	. 23		. 56			8	66	36
WL	. <u>.</u> 9			. 29	$.33 \pm .16$			108	109
WL	- Ω			. 41	$.54\pm.20$			139	109
44 weeks: Ot*				. 58			240	675	130
Average		. 13		. 46	. 45				
SHANK DIAMETER									
8 weeks:	-	60							
		. 63 . 60				_	$\frac{20}{20}$	$\begin{array}{c} 164 \\ 164 \end{array}$	15 15
Average	•	. 61			_				
WEIGHT/SHANK LENGT									
8 weeks:									
		. 44					20	164	15
		. 54						164	15
Average		. 49							
BREAST BLISTERS									
WR	C	. 16 . 00	. 24 . 00	. 20 . 00	enterine ferrore	_	$\frac{3}{3}$	$\frac{30}{30}$	58 58
Average		. 08	. 12	. 10					
	_								

Table 1.—Reported heritability estimates of body weight, weight gain, feed consumption, feed efficiency, conformation, market quality traits, and pigmentation, by age, breed, and sex of chickens—Continued

Trait, age, and breed of	Sex	Heritability estimate						Degree of freedom	
chicken		S	D	S+D	b _{op}	Real	S	D	
DRESSING PERCENT (BROILER)									
WRAC*	$\overset{{\tt c}}{\rm C}$. 69 . 12	. 32 . 16	. 50 . 14			$\begin{array}{c} 36 \\ 161 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 161 \\ 239 \end{array}$	171 139
Average		. 41	. 24	. 32			_		
SHANK PIGMENT									
8 weeks: Meat	♂	. 49 . 21 . 57 . 16	. 30 . 69 . 28 . 23	. 39 . 45 . 43 . 19	_ _ _		32 44 32 44	270 428 270 428	137 202 137 202
Average		. 36	. 38	. 37			-		

Table 2 summarizes the heritability estimates of egg production and other traits associated with

egg production.

There appears to be little, if any, difference in the average heritabilities of short, intermediate, and long-term survivor production (0.22, 0.19 and 0.22, respectively) based on the paternal half-sib correlation. However, the maternal half-sib average estimates are more than 30 percent higher (0.32, 0.35 and 0.30, respectively), suggesting a possible importance of either maternal or dominance effects, or both, for survivor production. There are fewer heritability estimates of shortand long-term hen-housed production and apparently these differ according to paternal halfsib correlation estimates (0.33 and 0.15). However, the average estimates from the maternal half-sib correlation are similar for both short- and longterm hen-housed production (0.40 and 0.41). As in survivor production, there is an apparent importance of either maternal or dominance effects, or both. Short-term rate of production appears to have a lower heritability (0.11) than short-term survivor production or hen-housed production; and again either maternal or dominance effects, or both, appear to be considerable as evidenced by the average maternal half-sib correlations (0.45). Long-term rate of production has an average heritability of 0.15 by the paternal half-sib correlation, but there is only one estimate by the maternal half-sib correlation (0.64). Winter rate of production appears to have a higher heritability, but all estimates were reported by a single investigator. There is no apparent importance of either maternal or dominance effects indicated by the meager data for this trait.

Egg mass appears to have a heritability of a magnitude similar to that of egg production. There is no convincing evidence of either maternal or dominance effects.

A great many estimates of the heritability of sexual maturity have been reported. The average of estimates tabulated for the paternal half-sib correlation indicates a heritability of approximately 0.39 for this trait in both light and heavy breeds.

There is limited information regarding broodiness, pauses, and persistency, but reports indicate a low heritability for these traits.

The heritability estimates of egg traits are

reported in table 3.

There are a large number of reports of the heritability of early and mature egg weight. The average estimates by the paternal half-sib correlation indicate a high heritability of early egg weight for light and heavy breeds (0.45 and 0.57). Similar average estimates of heritability of mature egg weight for light and heavy breeds (0.46 and 0.58) suggest no difference in the heritability of pullet and mature egg weight.

Either maternal or dominance effects, or both, are suggested by the fact that the maternal halfsib estimates are about 15 percent higher than the paternal half-sib estimates for early egg weight, but there is no indication of these effects for

mature egg weight.

Average estimates of the heritability of specific gravity for light and heavy breeds are 0.35 and 0.40 as estimated by the paternal half-sib correlation and there is no evidence of important maternal or dominance effects.

Egg shape appears to be quite highly heritable in both light and heavy breeds (0.35 and 0.32) as estimated by the paternal half-sib correlation.

Shell color is apparently quite highly heritable. There is evidence of important dominance or maternal influences, or both, as indicated by the difference in average paternal and maternal half-sib correlations (0.35 and 0.56).

Haugh units and albumen height have similar average paternal half-sib correlation estimates (0.42 and 0.43), but the average for albumen score is lower (0.27).

Reported estimates are too few to permit meaningful comments concerning the following traits: yolk weight, yolk weight/egg weight, yolk size, albumen weight, albumen weight/yolk weight, albumen percent, blood spots, meat spots, shell thickness, shell strength, shell texture, shell defects, yolk color, mottling, Haugh units stored, and quality loss.

Table 4 is a summary of fertility, hatchability,

mortality, aggressiveness, and physiological traits.

Based on estimates from only three reports, fertility appears to have a low heritability. Hatchability measured as a percentage of all eggs set has a lower average heritability (0.09) than hatchability measured on the probit scale (0.19). However, hatchability of fertile eggs, measured in percent, has a higher average heritability (0.14) than hatchability of fertile eggs measured on the probit scale (0.07).

Mortality up to 10 weeks of age, annual laying house mortality, and mortality due to leucosis are all apparently very lowly heritable (0.02, 0.08, and 0.09, respectively). There is also strong evidence of important maternal or dominance effects, or both, for early and laying house mortality.

Aggressiveness as measured by the realized heritability average is quite highly heritable (0.31).

There are so few estimates of heritability for all traits reported in table 4 that any discussion of the magnitude of the estimates does not seem justified.

Table 2.—Reported heritability estimates of egg production and production traits, by age and breed of chickens

Trait, age, and breed of chicken		Herita	bility estimat	e			ree of dom	Ref.
_	S	D	S+D	bop	Real.	s	D	-
SURVIVOR PRODUCTION								
Short term								
First 3 months: NHFirst 4 months:	0. 31	0. 19	0. 25			108	237	89
NH	. 37	. 21	. 29			108	237	89
Syn				0. 37		145	735	117
$\frac{\text{Syn}_{}}{17 \text{ weeks}} > \text{S.M.: S.}$	$.02 \pm .05$	$.15\pm.11$	$.09 \pm .05$	-		12	144	187
To Dec. 31: RIRXG	. 42			_				128
To January:								
WL	. 18					40	200	4
<u>W</u> L	. 31				_	40	200	4 17
WL	. 07				_	40	200	4
WL	. 16	. 35		-		15	136	17
<u>WL</u>	. 23	. 61				46	464	17
WL	. 18	. 43			-	$\frac{23}{24}$	$\frac{196}{796}$	17
WL	. 21	. 53	. 22			84	796	92 107
WL WL			. 48	_		$\begin{array}{c} 14 \\ 20 \end{array}$	$\frac{53}{74}$	107
	_		$\begin{array}{c} \cdot 40 \\ \cdot 32 \end{array}$	_	 -	20		111
$egin{array}{c} \mathrm{WL}_{} \\ \mathrm{WL}_{} \end{array}$. 16	$\frac{-}{12}$. 14			48	604	$\frac{111}{146}$
WL	. 14	. 24	. 19	-		100	904	198
S	$.21\pm .12$	$.29\pm.10$	$.{}^{13}_{25\pm}.07$	-		12	144	187
NH	. 21 1. 12		. 25					69
May 31 (Australia):			. 20					• • •
WL	. 29	. 36	$.33 \pm .05$			42	382	133
WL	$.23 \pm .10$			_	-	84	700	135
Average for short term	. 22	. 32	. 26	. 37		_		

Table 2.—Reported heritability estimates of egg production and production traits, by age and breed of chickens—Continued

Trait, age, and breed of chicken		Herita	bility estimate	•			ree of dom	Ref.
-	s	D	S+D	b _{ор}	Real.	s	D	•
SURVIVOR PRODUCTION—Continued			,					
Intermediate term								
To 240 days of age: NH	$\begin{array}{c} -11 \\ .11 \\ .16 \pm .10 \\ .28 \end{array}$. 16 . 23±. 11		. 15	=	48 12	245 144 —	117 148 187 86
44 weeks of age: WL	$.27 \pm .07$ $.13 \pm .07$	$.26\pm.07 \\ .45\pm.09$. 27 . 29	_		$\begin{array}{c} 105 \\ 105 \end{array}$	300 300	2 3 2 3
46 weeks of age: NH	. $\frac{28}{16}$. 05	. 20 . 17 . 26 . 13	. 26		36	190	34 55 69 78 117
RIR	. 18 . 23±. 07 . 21±. 13	 . 40±. 08 . 38±. 13	.31±.10 .29±.08		=	$^{31}_{245}$ 12	$121 \\ 994 \\ 144$	65 161 1 87
WLWLWL	. 14 . 14 . 20 . 16	. 34 . 61 . 46 . 52	 	<u>-</u>	=	15 46 23 84	136 464 196 796	17 17 17 92
Average for intermediate term	. 19	. 35	. 23	. 21			-	
Long term								
32 weeks>maturity: S 250 days>maturity:	$.14\pm.10$	$.35\pm.12$. $25\pm$. 07			12	144	187
BLXBL BLXS SXBL SXS 65 weeks of age: S	. 18±. 08 . 18±. 06 . 23±. 08 . 36±. 09 . 31±. 07 . 14	$\begin{array}{c} .22 \pm .14 \\ .38 \pm .12 \\ .30 \pm .12 \\ .32 \pm .11 \\ .48 \pm .13 \\ \hline \\ .14 \end{array}$. 17		65 65 65 12 4 8	660 660 660 144 —	63 63 63 187 101 146
500 days of age: WLXA Inbreds October to July: Mix	$\begin{array}{c} \cdot 44 \\ -24 \end{array}$. 59	=	. 29		19 98 36	152 751 269	11 162 71
72 weeks of age: WL	$\begin{array}{c} - \\ \cdot 32 \\ \cdot 21 \\ \cdot 42 \pm \cdot 12 \\ \cdot 23 \pm \cdot 13 \end{array}$. 45 . 14±. 09 . 31±. 10	$\begin{array}{c} \cdot 23 \\ -33 \pm \cdot 06 \\ \cdot 28 \pm \cdot 07 \\ \cdot 27 \pm \cdot 07 \\ \cdot 46 \end{array}$	_ _ _ _		36 52 42 46 12	97 299 382 232 144	1 29 133 59 187
WLTo June 1:			. 15			14	53	107
WL	. 02 . 15 . 10 . 12 . 27±. 14	. 33 . 40 . 48 . 44 	.24 .34±.08		— — — —	15 23 46 84 — 12	136 196 464 796 — 144	17 17 17 17 111 187 111

Table 2.—Reported heritability estimates of egg production and production traits, by age and breed of chickens—Continued

Trait, age, and breed of chicken		Herita	bility estimat	е			ree of edom	Ref.
	S .	, , D,	S+D	bop	Real.	s	D	•
SURVIVOR PRODUCTION—Continued							:	
Long term—Continued							į	
Annual: WL	$\begin{array}{c}\ 05 \\ .\ 09 \\ .\ 11 \\ \\ .\ 16 \pm .\ 09 \\ .\ 23 \pm .\ 12 \\ .\ 23 \\ .\ 30 \pm .\ 13 \\ .\ 16 \\ .\ 45 \\ \\ \\ .\ 38 \\ .\ 16 \\ \\ .\ 18 \pm .\ 05 \\ .\ 13 \\ .\ 16 \\ .\ 16 \\ .\ 25 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} \cdot 22 \\ \cdot 38 \\ \cdot 29 \\$	$\begin{array}{c}\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\$. 57 		15 46 23 36 20 18 18 130 130 4 20 48 30 64 108 15 28	136 464 196 190 179 156 1,000 1,000 1,000 1,000 237 48 69	177 177 39 777 88 88 810 110 1107 127 127 146 150 89 6 8114
400 to 450 days>maturity: S	$\begin{array}{c}\\ -2 \\ \cdot 42 \pm \cdot 12\\ \cdot 24 \pm \cdot 08\\ \cdot 11 \pm \cdot 06\\ \cdot 34 \pm \cdot 09\\ \cdot 16\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c}\\ \cdot 14 \pm \cdot 09\\ \cdot 00 \pm \cdot 13\\ \cdot 36 \pm \cdot 12\\ \cdot 30 \pm \cdot 12\\ \cdot 15 \end{array}$. 45 . 34 . 28±. 07 			26 24 46 65 65 65 48	104 83 232 660 660 660 604	61 61 62 63 63 63 146
Average for long term	. 22	. 30	. 27	. 31				
Month 1: NH Months 1 and 2: NH November and December:	. 15 . 32	. 21 . 15	. 18 . 24	<u></u>	_	108 108	237 237	89 89
WLBR	_	_	. 34 . 18	_		$\begin{array}{c} 10 \\ 10 \end{array}$	79 79	90 90
January and February: WL	=		. 59 . 34	_		$\begin{array}{c} 10 \\ 10 \end{array}$	79 79	90 90
January through March: WL WL WL WI Winter:	03 . 03 . 14	. 41 . 38 . 33	=	<u>-</u>		$\frac{15}{46}$ $\frac{23}{23}$	136 464 196	17 17 17
WL WL March and April:	=	_	$\begin{array}{c} .27 \\ .26 \end{array}$			$\begin{array}{c} 36 \\ \textbf{40} \end{array}$	97 137	1 2
WLBR			. 36 . 27	_	_	$\begin{array}{c} 10 \\ 10 \end{array}$	77 78	90 90
March through June: WLWL	12 . 10 . 10	. 37 . 30 . 25				$15 \\ 46 \\ 23$	136 464 196	17 17 17
May and June: WL WL BR		=	. 49 . 42 . 09	=		$10 \\ 10 \\ 10$	74 73 76	90 90 90

Table 2.—Reported heritability estimates of egg production and production traits, by age and breed of chickens—Continued

Trait, age, and breed of chicken		Herital	bility estimate	e			ree of dom	Ref.
_	S	D	S+D	b _{ов}	Real.	s	D	•
$\begin{array}{c} {\rm SURVIVOR} \\ {\rm PRODUCTION-\!Continued} \end{array}$								
July and August: WL BR	_		. 42 . 17			10 10	73 69	90 90
January 1 to 72 weeks of age: WL June to 365 days > S.M.:	$.16 \pm .11$					84	700	135
	19 . 24 . 24	. 06 . 35 . 18		 	=	$15 \\ 46 \\ 23$	136 464 196	17 17 17
BLXBL	$.24\pm.08$ $.11\pm.06$ $.34\pm.09$ $.29\pm.08$	$\begin{array}{c} .\ 22\pm .\ 14 \\ .\ 39\pm .\ 12 \\ .\ 21\pm .\ 12 \\ .\ 09\pm .\ 10 \end{array}$	_ _ _		_	65 65 65	660 660	63 63 63
Annual minus winter: WL September to February: WL To 28 weeks of age:	. 29±.00 — —	. 09±.10 —	. 14 . 55	_	=	$\begin{array}{c} 65 \\ 40 \\ 5 \end{array}$	$660 \\ 137 \\ 73$	63 2 16
WL	$.26\pm .07 .23\pm .08$	$.39\pm .07 \\ .44\pm .09$	$\begin{smallmatrix} .&32\\ .&33 \end{smallmatrix}$		_	$\begin{array}{c} 105 \\ 105 \end{array}$	$\frac{300}{300}$	23 23
WL	$.14\pm.05 \ .15\pm.06$	$.^{18\pm .06}_{.23\pm .08}$. 16 . 19	_		$\begin{array}{c} 105 \\ 105 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 300 \\ 300 \end{array}$	23 23
WL	$. 20 \pm . 06 \\ . 11 \pm . 06$	$.^{16}_{-41}_{\pm}.^{06}_{-09}$. 18 . 26	_	_	$\begin{array}{c} 105 \\ 105 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 300 \\ 300 \end{array}$	23 23
HEN HOUSED PRODUCTION								
Short term								
To December 31: WL	. 27 . 32 . 39	. 37 . 35 . 49	. 28 . 32±. 05 	. 10		42 84 84	383 796 796 —	111 133 92 92 34
Average for short term	. 33	. 40	. 24	. 15				
${f Long \ term} =$						·		
To May 31: WL	. 23±. 11 . 19 		. 22		_ _ _	$\frac{84}{84}$ $\frac{36}{36}$	700 796 269	135 111 92 71 111
To 500 days of age: WL* Ot* To 72 weeks of age:	. 07	. 59	. 20	=	_	$\begin{array}{c} 300 \\ 240 \end{array}$	1, 500 675	74 130
WLAnnual:	. 00 . 19	. 60 . 43	$.\overline{31} \pm .05$. $\overline{26}$	_	$\begin{array}{c} 60 \\ 42 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 260 \\ 383 \end{array}$	186 133
WL WL	. 16 . 24±. 06	.33 .36±.08		$.\frac{-}{30} \pm .08$	_	84 64 —	796 582 —	92 160 42
Average for long term	. 15	. 41	. 22	. 28			_	

Table 2.—Reported heritability estimates of egg production and production traits, by age and breed of chickens—Continued

Trait, age, and breed of chicken		Herital	oility estimate			Degr free	ee of	Ref.
	S	D	S+D	bop	Real.	S	D	
RATE OF PRODUCTION								
Short term								
To December 15:	15 1 04	60 19	90 1 0"			100	# 00	
Syn	$.15\pm.04$ $.13\pm.09$. 69±. 13 —	. 39±. 05 —	$.\overline{23}\pm.05$	_	$\begin{array}{c} 109 \\ 105 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 769 \\ 305 \end{array}$	4 1 97
To January 1: Syn	$.18 \pm .12$			$.23 \pm .04$		100	2 50	97
WL	. 14 . 06	. 16 . 43	. 15			$\frac{48}{104}$	$\frac{604}{365}$	146 91
WR	_		$egin{array}{c} \cdot 22 \\ \cdot 21 \end{array}$			$\frac{64}{32}$	380 192	167 168
WL			. 14			64	384	80
To 34 weeks of age: WL To 9 months of age:	$.07 \pm .05$					160	750	203
WL	_		$.08 \pm .02$ $.10 \pm .04$		_	$\begin{array}{c} 85 \\ 79 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 404 \\ 301 \end{array}$	143 143
To 260 days of age: WL	$03 \pm .32$	$.73 \pm .44$				100	500	207
RIR RIRXWL	$10\pm.48$ $.09\pm.30$	$\begin{array}{c} .92 \pm .60 \\ .28 \pm .39 \end{array}$				$\begin{array}{c} 100 \\ 100 \end{array}$	500 500	207 207
WLXRIRTo 40 weeks of age:	$.19\pm.27$	$08\pm.35$				100	500	207
WL*	$.15\pm .07$					340	1, 200	96
WL* RIR*	$.21\pm .07$ $.18\pm .06$	_	_			$\begin{array}{c} 340 \\ 562 \end{array}$	1, 200 3, 089	96 95
Average for short term	. 11	. 45	. 18	. 23				
Long term								
To 55 weeks of age:	15 . 05					0.40	1 000	
WL*	$\begin{array}{c} .\ 15\pm .\ 07 \\ .\ 06\pm .\ 07 \end{array}$					$\begin{array}{c} 340 \\ 340 \end{array}$	1, 200 1, 200	96 96
To 64 weeks of age: WL 22 to 64 weeks of age: WL	$.04\pm.06$ $.18\pm.05$		_			$\frac{160}{160}$	750 750	203 203
To 65 weeks of age: F			. $25\pm$. 02	_	-	79	301	143
To 70 weeks of age: WL*	$.16 \pm .07$				Berlinsel	340	1, 200	96
WL* To 72 weeks of age: WL	$.11\pm.07 \\ .16$. 64		_		$\frac{340}{104}$	1, 200 365	96 9 2
To May 31: MixAnnual:			. 51	. 00		159	609	197
WL	. 23		. 18	. 12	0. 04	140 99	1, 400 298	142 190
Average for long term	. 15	. 64	. 31	. 12	. 04			
Winter:								
Light	$\begin{smallmatrix} \textbf{.} & 02 \\ \textbf{.} & 36 \end{smallmatrix}$	$\frac{.38}{.45}$	$\frac{.29}{.41}$.35±.10	_	$\begin{array}{c} 25 \\ 25 \end{array}$	$\frac{278}{278}$	72
Light Heavy	. 25	. 17	. 27	. 15		19	243	72 72
Heavy Mix	$1.15 \\ .17 \pm .09$	$\begin{array}{c} .55 \\ .29 \pm .09 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} ext{.}85 \\ ext{.}30 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} .35\pm .10 \\ .07 \end{array}$		$\frac{19}{44}$	$\frac{243}{481}$	72 72
Mix	.85±.20	$.52 \pm .09$.68±.09	.35±.07		44	481	72
Average	. 47	. 40	. 47	. 25				
22 to 34 weeks of age: WL 34 to 64 weeks of age: WL 40 to 55 weeks of age:	$39\pm.05$ $02\pm.04$					160 160	750 750	203 203
WL*	$.15 \pm .07$					340	1, 200	96

Table 2.—Reported heritability estimates of egg production and production traits, by age and breed of chickens—Continued

Trait, age, and breed of chicken		Heritab	oility estimate)		Degr free	ree of dom	Ref.
	S	D	S+D	b _{op}	Real.	S	D	·
RATE OF PRODUCTION—Continued								
55 to 70 weeks of age: WL*	.06±.06 .10±.07	<u>=</u> = =	 . <u>41</u> . 38	 11 . 31 . 00	<u>-</u>	340 340 159 87 159	1, 200 1, 200 609 609	96 96 197 194 197
EGG MASS								
To January: S. To 17 weeks > S.M.: S To 32 weeks > S.M.: S To May: S. To 40 weeks of age: S To 55 weeks of age: S To 65 weeks of age: S To August: S.	$\begin{array}{c} .16 \pm .10 \\ .11 \pm .08 \\ .27 \pm .14 \\ .28 \pm .15 \\ .14 \pm .10 \\ .24 \pm .14 \\ .41 \pm .20 \\ .42 \pm .20 \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} .25 \pm .11 \\ .04 \pm .09 \\ .24 \pm .11 \\ .30 \pm .11 \\ .24 \pm .11 \\ .41 \pm .13 \\ .49 \pm .13 \\ .41 \pm .21 \\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} .20 \pm .07 \\ .08 \pm .06 \\ .25 \pm .08 \\ .29 \pm .08 \\ .19 \pm .07 \\ .33 \pm .08 \\ .45 \pm .10 \\ .41 \pm .10 \end{array}$		- - - - -	12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	144 144 144 144 144 144 144	187 187 187 187 187 187 187
SEXUAL MATURITY								
Light breeds: WL	$\begin{array}{c}$	$\begin{array}{c}$. 15 . 12 ————————————————————————————————————	.35		36 40 160 15 46 23 105 105 52 — 168 300 84 104 340 25 42 — 20 100 245 60 464 501 24 65 19 100 65 98	97 137 750 136 464 196 300 299 1,500 796 365 1,200 1,200 1,200 1,200 218 68 500 994 260 3,036 4,769 84 66 152 500 660 751	12 203 17 17 17 23 29 39 68 68 74 92 91 96 100 100 108 111 127 147 207 161 186 63 31 207 63 63 63 63 63 63
-		4.4				98	751	10%
Average for light breeds	. 39	. 44	. 42	. 31				

Table 2.—Reported heritability estimates of egg production and production traits, by age and breed of chickens—Continued

	,	CHURCHES - C	onunaea				*	
Trait, age, and breed of chicken		Herital	bility estimate)			ree of dom	Ref.
	S	D	S+D	Ьор	Real.	S	D	
SEXUAL MATURITY—Con.								
Heavy breeds: WR	$\begin{array}{c}$. 25 	. 41 . 28 . 49 . 38 . 39 . 25 . 30 . 18±. 05 . 41 . 34 . 07 	. 40±. 14 . 33 		71 64 64 32 	318 384 380 192 3, 089 140 500 237 232 — 107 675 320 265 — 660	205 80 167 168 8 95 149 207 34 89 62 8 61 130 97 97 101 63 128
Average for heavy breeds =	. 39	. 25	. 32	. 31	-			
BROODINESS Nag.XWL	. 16	. 56	. 11			30	70	156
PAUSES							•	
Long: MixShort: MixWinter:	-		. 23 . 21	. 20 . 16	_		<u>:</u>	101 101
RIR	. 08 . 12	. 09 . 20				$\begin{array}{c} 100 \\ 100 \end{array}$	438 438	64 64
Average	. 10	. 15	. 22	. 18			<u>.</u>	
PERSISTENCY							,	
S Mix	. 20	. 49	. 10					8 101
OVIPOSITION INTERVAL								
WL	. 59	. 74	. 66			20	69	182

Table 3.—Reported heritability estimates of egg traits, by breed of chickens

Their of any and breed of shield		Heritabil	ity estimate				ree of edom	Dof.
Trait of egg and breed of chicken	s	D	S+D	b _{op}	Real.	s	D	Ref.
EARLY EGG WEIGHT								
Light breeds: WL	$\begin{array}{c} 0.49\\ .33\pm.03\\ .25\pm.08\\ .38\pm.08\\ .45\pm.10\\ .47\pm.10\\ \hline \\ .\\ .\\ .\\ .\\ .\\ .\\ .\\ .\\ .\\ .\\ .\\ .\\ .$	$\begin{array}{c}$	$\begin{array}{c}$	0. 33 	0. 40±. 05 ————————————————————————————————————	40 80 105 105 105 105 230 115 40 84 104 300 340 42 42 100 245 60 501 45 100	200 350 300 300 300 300 2, 270 1, 135 	4 203 23 23 23 23 40 40 70 87 92 91 94 96 96 96 108 108 207 161 186 207 207
Average for light breeds	. 45	. 53	. 45	. 52	. 40			
Heavy breeds: WR. WR. RIR. RIR. NH. S. S. S. WG* Syn. Average for heavy breeds	$\begin{array}{c} -\\ -\\ .72\pm.09\\ .01\pm.67\\ .62\\ .75\pm.31\\ .70\pm.30\\ .87\pm.31\\ .60\\ .28\pm.28\\ .57 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} -\\ -\\ -\\ -\\ .31\pm.77\\ .56\\ .72\pm.17\\ .80\pm.16\\ .76\pm.13\\ .76\pm.21\\ .65 \end{array}$	$ \begin{array}{c} $. 62		64 32 544 100 108 12 12 12 — 109	380 192 2, 692 500 237 144 144 144 769	167 168 95 207 89 187 187 187 41
MATURE EGG WEIGHT								
Light breeds: WL WL	$\begin{array}{c} -\\ -\\ \cdot 47\\ \cdot 53\\ \cdot 61\pm \cdot 05\\ \hline \cdot 44\pm \cdot 10\\ \cdot 45\pm \cdot 10\\ \cdot 53\pm \cdot 11\\ \cdot 61\pm \cdot 09\\ \cdot 32\\ \cdot 59\\ \cdot 37\\ \hline \cdot 68\\ -\\ -\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c}\\\\\\\\\\ \cdot 68\pm \cdot 09\\ \cdot 60\pm \cdot 09\\ \cdot 50\pm \cdot 09\\ \cdot 52\pm \cdot 09\\ \cdot 56\\\\\\ \cdot 58\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\ -$. 51 . 49 			36 40 40 40 80 5 105 105 105 16 52 — 40 40	97 137 200 200 350 73 300 300 300 77 299 ————————————————————————————————	1 2 4 4 203 16 23 23 23 24 29 29 39 69 70

Table 3.—Reported heritability estimates of egg traits, by breed of chickens—Continued

m		Heritab	ility estimate	ı		Degr free	ee of dom	T) - f
Trait of egg and breed of chicken -	S	D	S+D	b _{op}	Real.	S	D	Ref.
MATURE EGG WEIGHT—Continued								
Light breeds—Continued WL		9		. 16		40		70
WL	. 51	_				36	190	77
$egin{array}{c} \mathrm{WL}_{} \ \mathrm{WL}_{} \end{array}$. 36 . 80± . 24	$-\frac{1}{43\pm .13}$	$.61 \pm .12$	_		36 20	$\frac{380}{179}$	78 88
WL	$.~35\pm .~16$	$.62 \pm .16$	$.48 \pm .09$			18	156	88
WL	$.55 \pm .20$	$.58 \pm .12$	$.57 \pm .09$			18	180	88
WL	$.\ 45\pm .\ 24 \ .\ 14$	$\begin{array}{l} .\ 56\pm .\ 18 \\ .\ 20 \end{array}$	$.50\pm .10$			$10 \\ 84$	108 796	88 92
WL*	$\dot{53}$. 58	-			300	1,500	94
WL*	$.52\pm .10$					340	1, 200	96
WL* WL	$.41 \pm .09$.73		. 47	. 39		$\begin{array}{c} 340 \\ 42 \end{array}$	$1,200 \\ 218$	96 08
$\mathrm{WL}_{}$			$\frac{1}{42}$		-			111
WL	. 29						+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	127
WL			$.\frac{-}{59} \pm .02$. 61	$\begin{array}{c} 140 \\ 85 \end{array}$	1, 400 404	142 143
WL*			$.67 \pm .13$			30	260	150
WL*			$.55\pm.12$	_	-	30	260	150
WL	$.09\pm .33$	$.86 \pm .45$. 00			$^{100}_{5}$	500 58	207 157
WL*	. 67	. 41	- 00			60	260	186
WL	. 18	. 41		_		10	75	200
WL's	. 19	. 18	. 10	*****			_	148 153
WLX's	. 50		. 47			464	3, 036	31
F	. 31	. 26	. 29			15	48	6
F BL			. 55±.06 . 66	_		$79 \\ 24$	301 83	143 61
BLXBL	$.46 \pm .11$.49±.14				$\frac{24}{65}$	660	63
BLXLS	$.42 \pm .10$	$.55 \pm .12$	_			65	660	63
LSXBLRIRXWL	$\begin{array}{c} .96 \pm .16 \\ .30 \pm .35 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} .\ 29\pm .\ 12 \\ .\ 47\pm .\ 41 \end{array}$			_	$\begin{array}{c} 65 \\ 100 \end{array}$	660 500	63 207
WLXRIR.	$.50\pm .33$	$.06\pm .43$				100	500	207
Inbreds				. 61		98	751	162
Mix	. 36	. 45	. 50 . 50	. 44		$\begin{array}{c} \bf 34 \\ \bf 25 \end{array}$	150 278	38 72
Average for light breeds	. 46	. 49	. 49	. 32	. 61			
Heavy breeds:								
WŘ			. 66			71	318	205
WR.			. 67		1. 07	64	384	80 152
RIR	. 38	. 82	. 33	_	_	4	50	157 8
RIR	$.41 \pm .14$	$.60 \pm .12$	$.51\pm.08$			26	245	88
RIR	$.78 \pm .10$	C1				545	2, 261	95
RIR NH	$.30\pm .55$	$.55 \pm .61$. 54		_	$\begin{array}{c} 100 \\ 13 \end{array}$	500 60	207 157
NH	. 53	. 25	. 39				-	69
§	. 20	. 49				96	104	8
S S	$.\overline{73} \pm .22$	$.73\pm .13$	$^{.54}_{.73\pm.10}$			$\begin{array}{c} 26 \\ 22 \end{array}$	104 194	61 88
Š	$.81 \pm .33$	$.83\pm .19$	$.82 \pm .14$			$\overline{12}$	144	187
§	$.50 \pm .24$	$.65 \pm .17$	$.58 \pm .12$			$\frac{12}{10}$	144	187
S S	$.77 \pm .31 .49 \pm .24$	$.74 \pm .16 .70 \pm .15$	$.76\pm .13$ $.60\pm .11$	_		$\begin{array}{c} 12 \\ 12 \end{array}$	144 144	187 187
S	$.76\pm .31$	$.83 \pm .17$	$.79 \pm .13$			12	144	187
A	. 61					28	69	114
Ot* WG*	. 60	. 43	. 67 . 52			240	675	130 55
WG*	. 72	. 29	. 50	_		_	Ξ	55
Mix	. 72			. 46	_	59	457	45 72
Mix	1. 15	. 55	. 89	. 42		19	243	72

Table 3.—Reported heritability estimates of egg traits, by breed of chickens—Continued

		Herital	oility estimate	;		$\begin{array}{c} \mathbf{Deg}_{1} \\ \mathbf{free} \end{array}$	ree of dom	D. f
Trait of egg and breed of chicken -	s	D	S+D	bop	Real.	s	D	Ref.
MATURE EGG WEIGHT—Continued								
Heavy breeds—Continued Mix	$.85\pm.20$ $.42\pm.10$ $.29\pm.08$ $.36\pm.11$ $.37$	$.52 \pm .09$ $.16 \pm .11$ $.02$. 75 . 52 . 26±. 09 . 20	. 43 . 52 		$\begin{array}{c} 44 \\ 159 \\ 105 \\ 100 \\ 50 \\ 50 \end{array}$	481 609 315 265 50 50	72 197 97 97 151
Average for heavy breeds	. 58	. 54	. 58	. 46	1. 07			
YOLK WEIGHT	. 43±. 15	.44±.23	.43±.13			40	287	87
YOLK WEIGHT/ EGG WEIGHT	. 20±. 08 . 48	. 04	=	 	<u></u>	40 10	287 75	87 200
YOLK SIZE	. 39	. 33	-			10	75	200
ALBUMEN WEIGHT WL NH BR	. 38	. 23	. <u>02</u> . <u>68</u> . 12	 	_ _ _	$\begin{array}{c} 5 \\ 10 \\ 13 \\ 4 \end{array}$	58 75 60 50	157 200 157 157
Average	. 38	. 23	. 27					
ALBUMEN WEIGHT/YOLK WEIGHT								
WL WL WL NH BR	.78 .34 	. 13 . 49 	.46 $.41$ $.12$ $.00$ $.02$		 	11 10 5 13 14	45 58 58 60 50	102 102 157 157 157
Average	. 56	. 31	. 21					
ALBUMEN PERCENT WL	. 38	. 23		_		10	75	200
## BLOOD SPOTS WL	· 23 · 13 · 02	. 28	. <u>32</u> . <u>20</u>	=	<u>-</u> - - -	52 — 300 464	299 	2: 3: 9: 3:
$f Average_{}$. 13	. 28	. 26					

Table 3.—Reported heritability estimates of egg traits, by breed of chickens—Continued

Trait of own and broad of shirt		Herital	oility estimate	!			ree of edom	
Trait of egg and breed of chicken	S	D	S+D	bop	Real.	S	D	Ref.
MEAT SPOTS								
RIRRIR	. <u>14</u> 	. 23	<u>-</u>	=	. 68 . 26	$\frac{42}{119}$	$\frac{316}{721}$	118 120 120
SPECIFIC GRAVITY Light breeds:							•	
WL. WL. WL. WL* WL* WL* WL* WL* WL* WL* WL/s WL/s WL/s WLX/s WLX/s WLX/s WLXA RIRXWL	$\begin{array}{c} \cdot 26 \\ \cdot 35 \pm \cdot 15 \\ \cdot 14 \pm \cdot 09 \\ \cdot 24 \pm \cdot 16 \\ \cdot 34 \\ \cdot 62 \pm \cdot 10 \\ \cdot 30 \pm \cdot 09 \\ \cdot 45 \pm \cdot 42 \\ \cdot 30 \\ \hline \\ \cdot \\ \cdot$	$ \begin{array}{c} - \\ - 52 \pm . 15 \\ - 42 \pm . 15 \\ - 70 \pm . 19 \\ - 33 \\ - \\ - \\ - 06 \pm . 50 \\ - 06 \\ - \\ - \\ - \\ - \\ - \\ - \\ - \\ $				52 20 18 10 300 340 340 100 60 10 464 501 45 100	299 179 156 108 1, 500 1, 200 1, 200 260 75 3, 036 4, 769 208 500 500	29 88 88 88 94 96 207 186 90 31 73 136 207
Average for light breeds	. 35	. 34	. 32					
Heavy breeds; WR	$\begin{array}{c}$. 39 . 44 . 44 . 05 			64 32 71 10 478 100 50 50	380 192 318 77 1,700 500 50 50	167 168 205 90 95 207 151 151
Average for heavy breeds	. 40	. 03	. 30			_		
SHELL THICKNESS								
WL WL Mix			.38±.09 .27	. 17	=	40 30 34	260 150	70 150 38
SHELL STRENGTH								
WL	-	-	. 53			10	67	184
SHELL TEXTURE								
Mix	_	_	. 27			34	150	38
SHELL DEFECTS								
WL's	. 05	_	. 08			464	3, 036	31

Table 3.—Reported heritability estimates of egg traits, by breed of chickens—Continued

		Herital	oility estimate				ree of edom	D. (
Trait of egg and breed of chicken	S	D	S+D	b _{op}	Real.	S	D	Ref.
EGG SHAPE								
Light breeds: WL WL- WL's WL* WL- WL WL WL WL WL WL's WLX's	. 55 	$\begin{array}{c} -\\ -\\ -\\ -\\ -\\ -\\ .51\pm.53\\ -\\ -\\ .15\pm.46\\ .32\pm.45 \end{array}$. 73 . 39 . 22 . 30	= = = = = = =		$\begin{array}{r} 52 \\ \hline 40 \\ 340 \\ 340 \\ 100 \\ 12 \\ 464 \\ 100 \\ 100 \\ \end{array}$	299 	29 69 70 96 96 207 158 31 207 207
Average for light breeds	. 35	. 33	. 41					
Heavy breeds: NH	$\begin{matrix} -&\\ .66\pm.53\\ .11\\ .51\\ .11\\ .28\pm.14\\ .29\\ .28\end{matrix}$	$\begin{array}{c}$. 56 . 10 . 35 . 27±. 09			100 — — 50 50	500 — — 50 50	69 207 55 55 86 151 151
Average for heavy breeds	. 32	. 17	. 32					
YOLK COLOR WL Mix SHELL COLOR	Ξ	Ξ	. 05	Ξ	Ξ	$\frac{10}{34}$	67 150	184 38
WL*	$\begin{array}{c} .48\\ .17\\ .54\\ .51\pm .19\\ .37\pm .17\\ .12\pm .08\\ .54\pm .27\\ .27\\ .89\pm .22\\ .34\pm .14\\ .24\pm .17\\ .16\pm .12\\ .17\pm .12\\ .18\pm .10\\ .30\\ \hline .30\pm .11\\ .43\\ \hline .35\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} .43\\ .33\\ .49\\ .55\pm .15\\ .72\pm .16\\ .57\pm .12\\ .63\pm .18\\ \hline \\ .52\pm .11\\ .77\pm .21\\ .65\pm .20\\ .56\pm .15\\ .53\pm .14\\ .91\\ \hline \\ .25\pm .14\\ .34\\ \hline \\ .56\\ \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c}$.78		78 301 317 20 18 18 10 464 26 12 12 12 12 22 12 34 50 ———————————————————————————————————	149 946 980 179 156 180 3,036 245 144 144 144 194 97 150 50	56 56 88 88 88 88 75 75 75 75 88 12 38 151 151
Average	. 00	. 50	. 10	. 10				
MOTTLING WL* WL*		. 10 36 . 04	=	_ 	<u>-</u>	104 104 104	365 365 365	93 93 93

Table 3.—Reported heritability estimates of egg traits, by breed of chickens—Continued

Their of any and broad of chicken		Herital	oility estimate	Э			ree of edom	
Trait of egg and breed of chicken	s	D	S+D	b _{op}	Real.	s	D	Ref.
HAUGH UNITS					*		:	
WL	. 30		_			52	299	33
WL	$.55 \pm .20$	$.\frac{-}{23\pm.13}$	$\overset{-}{\cancel{}}$. 11		$\begin{array}{c} 40 \\ 20 \end{array}$	$1\overline{79}$	70 88
WL	$\begin{array}{c} .\ 54\pm .\ 20 \\ .\ 70\pm .\ 23 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} .43\pm .14 \\ .53\pm .11 \end{array}$	$.48\pm.11$ $.62\pm.11$			18 18	$\frac{156}{180}$	88 88
WL	. 68	. 55	. 60±. 15		-	$\begin{array}{c} 104 \\ 30 \end{array}$	365 260	93 150
WL. WLX's			. 21 . 32		-		200	199
WLXA	. 57				_	45	208	199 136
WR			. 37 . 43	_		$\begin{array}{c} 64 \\ 32 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 380 \\ 192 \end{array}$	167 168
WR's NH	. 35		. 44			$\begin{array}{c} 71 \\ 12 \end{array}$	$\frac{318}{125}$	2 05 49
RIRS	$.47\pm.14$ $.50\pm.17$	$.34\pm.11$ $.55\pm.13$	$.40\pm.08$ $.52\pm.09$	_		$egin{smallmatrix} 2\overline{6} \ 22 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{array}{c} 245 \\ 194 \end{array}$	88 88
SynSyn		$.08 \pm .07$	$.02 \pm .08$.04			50	50	151
Average	. 42	. 35	. 37	. 11		50	50	<u> 151</u>
=	. 12	. UU	. 01	. 11				
HAUGH UNITS — STORED							;	
2 weeks: WL	. 66	. 57		_		104	365	93
WLXA	. 28	_		-		45	208	136
ALBUMEN SCORE								
WL*	$\begin{array}{c} \cdot 29 \\ \cdot 10 \end{array}$	$\frac{-}{71}$				52	299 365	2 9 91
WL*	. 29	.40			_	$\frac{104}{300}$	1, 500	94
WL*	$.38 \pm .09$ $.23 \pm .09$		_	_	_	$\frac{340}{340}$	1, 200 1, 200	96 96
WL	$.67 \pm .40$	$.21 \pm .47$. 59			$\begin{array}{c} 100 \\ 10 \end{array}$	500 67	207 184
WL*	. 25 . 40	. 06	. 42		_	60 464	260 3, 036	186 31
RIRXWL WLXRIR	$.08 \pm .39$ $.16 \pm .38$	$\begin{array}{l} .\ 15\pm .\ 49 \\ .\ 04\pm .\ 45 \end{array}$				100	500	207
RIR	$.28\pm .10$		_	_		$\frac{100}{478}$	500 1, 700	207 95
RIR	.11±.51	. 62±. 56				100	500	207
Average=	. 21	. 31	. 51					
ALBUMEN HEIGHT								
WL	$.68\pm .22$ $.56\pm .21$	$.29\pm.13$ $.48\pm.15$	$.48\pm.11$ $.52\pm.11$	_		20 18	$\frac{179}{156}$	88 88
WL			. 55			10	79	90
WL			.56±.14 .36	_		30	260	150 199
WLX's BR		_	. 23 . 55			10	$\overline{76}$	199 90
WG*	. 05		. 22			34	150	86 38
Average	. 43	. 39	. 43				100	
=	• 30	. 00	. 10					

Table 3.—Reported heritability estimates of egg traits, by breed of chickens—Continued

The it of the state of the latest		Heri	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{Degree of} \\ \textbf{freedom} \end{array}$		Ref.			
Trait of egg and breed of chicken	S	D	S+D	b₀₽	Real.	s	D	rei.
QUALITY LOSS								
Haugh units, 14 days: WL* WL_ Stored Haugh units/fresh Haugh units:	. 22 . 25	. 23 . 58	_		_	104 50	365 250	93 103
WL	. 28	. 23				104	365	93
Albumen height loss, 12 days: WLWL	01 56	. 04 . 18		_	•	$\begin{array}{c} 20 \\ 20 \end{array}$	173 165	121 121

Table 4.—Reported heritability estimates of fertility, hatchability, mortality, aggressiveness, and physiological traits, by breed and sex of chickens

Trait and breed of chicken	Sex		He	eritability est	imate			ree of edom	Ref.
		s	D	S+D	b _{op}	Real.	S	D	
FERTILITY									
NH NH Inbreds	· Q	0. 02	0. 21	0. 01 . 14 —	$0.02 \pm .04$.06	=	43 40 87	79 280 —	26 47 194
Average		. 02	. 21	. 08	. 04				
HATCHABILITY All eggs-percent: NH	Q Q Q	. 13 . 04 . 11 . 11 . 08	= = = =		. 07±. 04	_ _ 	10 43 	100 79 100 100	20 26 18 20 20
Average	. —	. 09			. 07				
All eggs-probit: NH SO Mix Mix Mix NHXSO SOXNH	O+ O+ O+ O+	. 27 . 12 . 20 . 20 . 19 . 13	= = = = =	=	= = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =	= = = = =	$ \begin{array}{c} 10 \\ \hline 10 \\ \hline 10 \\ 10 \\ 10 \\ \hline 10 \end{array} $	100 100 — 100 100 100	20 20 18 20 20 20
Average	. —	. 19							

Table 4.—Reported heritability estimates of fertility, hatchability, mortality, aggressiveness, and physiological traits, by breed and sex of chickens—Continued

Trait and breed of chicken	Sex		Heri	tability esti	mate			gree of eedom	Ref.
		S	D	S+D	bop	Real.	s	D	•
HATCHABILITY—Con.									
Fertile eggs-percent:	0	1.0	0.0				- 0		
WLNH	Ŷ Ŷ	. 16 . 06	. 23				$\begin{array}{c} 16 \\ 10 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 77 \\ 100 \end{array}$	24 20
NH	ģ	. 65				_	47	730	27
NH	Ŷ	. 29 . 04	$\phantom{00000000000000000000000000000000000$	$\frac{-}{10}$			$\begin{array}{c} 47 \\ 40 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 730 \\ 280 \end{array}$	27 47
SO Inbreds	Ŷ	. 12			1.6		10	100	20
$Inbreds_{}$	Ŷ			$\overline{02}$. 16		84 87	$\begin{array}{c} 396 \\ 813 \end{array}$	162 195
NHXSO	ģ	. 04		_		-	10	100	20
SOXNH Mix		05 . 08					$\begin{array}{c} 10 \\ 36 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 100 \\ 269 \end{array}$	20 71
Mix		. 05					_		18
Average		. 14		. 06	. 16	_			
Fertile eggs-probit:	0	1.4					4.0	100	
NH NH	<u>Р</u> Р	. 14 . 02			$.\overline{04}\pm.04$		$\frac{10}{43}$	$\begin{array}{c} 100 \\ 79 \end{array}$	20 26
SO NHXSO		. 23	-				10	100	20
SOXNH	Q	. 07 —. 14	_				$\frac{10}{10}$	$\begin{array}{c} 100 \\ 100 \end{array}$	20 20
Mix	\$. 08							18
Average	_	. 07	_		. 04				-
Fertile eggs at 30% hatch:	_	40	F 100						
WL Fertile eggs at 50% hatch:	Ŷ	. 42	. 57		*******		16	77	24
WLFertile eggs at 70% hatch:	Ф	. 36	. 56	_		******	16	77	24
WL	9	. 21	. 51		-		16	77	24
HATCHING TIME									
WL	9	. 49	. 58	_			16	77	24
MORTALITY									
Embryonie:	~			0.1				0.4.0	40*
1 week: Inbreds 2 weeks: Inbreds				. 01 . 01			87 87	$ 813 \\ 813 $	195 195
3 weeks: Inbreds	$\dot{\mathbf{C}}$	_		. 01		-	87	813	195
Growing: Chick: Inbreds	\mathbf{C}	_		. 05			87	813	195
0 to 3 weeks: WL	\mathbf{C}	$.03 \pm .01$. 36±. 05				108	968	134
A3 to 6 weeks:		$.02\pm .02$	$.37 \pm .07$			-	43	372	134
WL		02 ± 02	$.18 \pm .04$	-			108	968	134
A	C	$.00 \pm .00$	$.07 \pm .07$				43	372	134
WL		03 ± 02	$.28 \pm .04$			Minimum	108	968	134
To 10 weeks: WL+X's	Č	$.01\pm.02 \\ .02$. 36±. 07	. 13			$\begin{array}{c} 43 \\ 464 \end{array}$	$372 \\ 3,036$	134 31
Average of growing mortality		. 02	. 27	. 04					

Table 4.—Reported heritability estimates of fertility, hatchability, mortality, aggressiveness, and physiological traits, by breed and sex of chickens—Continued

Trait and breed of chicken	Sex		Heri	tability estim	ate		Deg fre	gree of edom	Ref.
	•	S	D	S+D	bop	Real.	s	D	
MORTALITY—Continued								,	
11 to 20 weeks: WL+X's 21 to 60 weeks: WL+X's 61 to 70 weeks: WL+X's 0 to 72 weeks: WL+X's	\mathbf{C}	.02 $.05$ $.00$ $.05$. 04 . 08 . 07 . 10		<u> </u>	464 464 464 464	3, 036 3, 036	31 31 31 31
Annual: WL		. 08	. 11	.08 .09±.03			>100	-	113 154
In laying house: WL+X's Mix WLX's	Ω .	. 08±. 06 . 06	. 27±. 16	. 10±. 05 . 05	<u>-</u> -		23 36 —	67 269 —	60 71 42
Average annual	. —	. 08	. 19	. 08					
From leucosis: WW WL	· φ · φ	. 03±. 04 . 07	. 15±. 14	.04±.04 .08			$>_{100}^{23}$	67	60 113
From lymphomatosis: S	9 9 9 9	$.00\pm.00$ $.04\pm.02$ $.05$ $.12$ $.14$ $.24$. 04±. 01 . 16±. 05 . 03 	$\begin{array}{c} .\ 01\pm.\ 00 \\ .\ 05\pm.\ 02 \\ .\ 05\pm.\ 02 \\ .\ 22 \\ .\ 20 \\ .\ 12 \end{array}$			40 46 8 9 9	248 281 40 135 135	141 141 154 196 196 196
Average	. —	. 09	. 10	. 10					
From other diseases: WL From reproduction disorders	. Р	. 03 . 07 . 02	. 06 . 06	. 03 . 07±. 02 . 03±. 02			>100 8 8	 40 40	113 154 154
LIVEABILITY									
Brooder: WW To 10 weeks of age: Mix Mix Laying: Mix To 365 days of age: RIR To 72 weeks of age: WL	. С . С . °	$.07 \pm .01$ $.11$ $.20$ $.03$ $.08$. 14±. 01 — — — —	. 10±. 01 — . 12 —		 	54 — — 42 52	363 ———————————————————————————————————	59 18 18 101 66 29
RESISTANCE TO ROUS SARCOMA VIRUS		00					10	50	
WC	$\overline{\mathbf{C}}$. 28	. 78	. 77			13 10	59 4 3	14 152
ADRENAL WEIGHT Left: WR Right: WR Both: WR	- ♂ - ♂ - ♂	<u> </u>		. 42 . 53 . 57	<u>-</u> -		50 50 50	109 109 109	172 172 172

Table 4.—Reported heritability estimates of fertility, hatchability, mortality, aggressiveness, and physiological traits, by breed and sex of chickens—Continued

AGGRESSIVENESS Domination: WLAC	C	S	D	S+D	bop	Real.			
Domination: WL AC	. C					Tocal.	S	D :	
WLAC	. C								
AC	. C								
						0. 22 . 57	36	4 3	57 163
WL					_	27			98
WL	. ģ					. 39		+	98
WL WR	. ç					. 70 . 01			98 98
A	. 9					. 24			98
RIR	- Þ					. 88			98
Average	. —		. 52	. 33		. 31			
	~					10		40	~~
Encounters won: WL Matings completed:		-				. 18	36	43	57
ACAC	o₹		. 52	. 33		$.18 \pm .05$	60	240	169
AC	. ♂	-				$.31\pm.11$	60	240	169
BLOOD									
Albumen, 8 weeks: WL, RIR-Alkaline phosphatase:	C	. 60			_		12	159	104
WL*	- <u>P</u>				. 36		52	119	192
WL	- Ç	. 40 . 03	. 35 . 00				$\begin{array}{c} 13 \\ 13 \end{array}$	42 66	181 181
Alpha 1 globulin, 8 weeks:		. 00	. 00						
WL, RIR Alpha 2 globulin, 8 weeks:	_ C	. 42					12	159	104
WL, RIR Alpha 3 globulin, 8 weeks:	_ C	. 28					12	159	104
WL, RIR	_ C	. 11	ninettyji				12	159	104
Beta+Gamma globulin, 8 weeks: WL, RIR	C	. 58					12	159	104
Hemoglobin, 1 day: WL, RIR	_ C	$\overset{\cdot}{.}\overset{\circ}{21}$	-	-			$\overline{19}$		10
Hemoglobin, 2 weeks: ARR*	C	>1.0			-		19		104 102
Hemoglobin, 4 weeks: ARB*—Hemoglobin, 6 weeks: ARB*—	C	. 31 . 36					19 19		102
Hemoglobin, 10 weeks: ARB*_	- č	. 36				-	1 9		102
Hemoglobin, 12 weeks: ARB*_	_ C	. 83					19	-	10.
Hemoglobin, 14 weeks: ARB*	- C	. 36					$\frac{19}{19}$	-	102 102
Hemoglobin, 17 weeks: ARB*_Red blood cell volume	- <u>C</u>	. 16 . 39	$.\overline{27}$. 35	. 27		51	207	188
Carotinoid concentration	-	. 00						:	
Syn meat	- ŏ <u>'</u>	. 21	. 84		_		$\frac{20}{20}$		179 179
Syn meatSerum cholesterol, 6 weeks:	- Y	. 32	. 54				20	-	
W T	- 9	. 34	. 17	. 25	-	*****	52	116	19
Serum cholesterol, 9 weeks: WL	- P	. 19	. 41	. 30			49	114	2
Pressure, mature:	~71					. 15	63	190	186
	. - ♀					. 09	63	190	180
Pressure, 19 weeks:	C					. 13	63	190	180
WR	o ⁷¹			. 05					188
WR	- Ω		-	 04			$\frac{-}{12}$	159	18: 10:
Protein, total: WL, RIR Prothrombin time:	. _ C	. 00					14	108	
WR	- وًا	-		. 53 . 03		. 47 . 38			13: 13:

Table 4.—Reported heritability estimates of fertility, hatchability, mortality, aggressiveness, and physiological traits, by breed and sex of chickens—Continued

Trait and breed of chicken	Sex		Heri	tability estim	ate			ree of edom	Ref.
	_	S	D	S+D	b _{op}	Real.	S	D	
BURSA WEIGHT									
Hatching: WG	. C	. 30	=	. 32 . 48 . 33		<u>-</u> -	<u></u>	 109	82 82 54 172
COMB WEIGHT RESPONSE	C								
To testosterone propionate: High Low To Pregnant mare serum		=	<u> </u>		$.44 \pm .08$ $.27 \pm .08$ $.42 \pm .11$			160 160 160	140 140 140
HEAT TOLERANCE									
WL*	- C	$.44 \pm .26$.47 \pm .26	• 4 5±. 15		-	42	157	193
HEMAGGLUTINATION TITER									
For Newcastle virus:WL	- C			. 77	-		10	43	152
SEMEN VOLUME									
6 to 7 months: WR WR	- ♂ - ♂	.41±.30	_	. 14	_	=	$64\\24$	380 —	167 177
SPERM CONCENTRATIO	N								
WR	- 0 ⁷ - 0 ⁷	. <u>46</u> ±. 30		. 01		_	24 64	- 380	177 167
SPERM MOTILITY									
WR	- ♂ - ♂	. 87±. 40		. 29	_	_	$\begin{array}{c} 64 \\ 24 \end{array}$	380	167 177
SPLEEN WEIGHT									
1 day: WG* 11 days: WG* 27 days: WG*	- C - C	<u>-</u> . 57	-	. 78 . 50				_	54 82 82
TESTES WEIGHT									
1 day: WG*	- ở - ở - ở			. 70 . 60 18 . 43			 50 8	221 221 109 66	84 84 172 35

Table 4.—Reported heritability estimates of fertility, hatchability, mortality, aggressiveness, and physiological traits, by breed and sex of chickens—Continued

Trait and breed of chicken	Sex		${ m He}$	eritability est	imate			ree of edom	Ref.
		S	D	S+D	bop	Real.	s	Ď	
TESTES WEIGHT RESPONSE									
100 mg. LH injected: WR 200 mg. LH injected: WR 5 mg. FSH injected: WR 10 mg. FSH injected: WR 20 mg. FSH injected: WR 64 mg. FSH injected: WR	``````````````````````````````````````	. 24 0. 00 . 04 . 16 . 64	 	. 24			8 8 5 5 5 5		174 174 174 174 174 174
THYROID WEIGHT									
4 weeks: NH	- ♂			. 92 . 33	_		$\begin{smallmatrix} 5\\50\end{smallmatrix}$	74 109	159 172
NH NH	· 0	. 04 . 07		$\frac{.58}{.62}$			8 8	66 66	35 35
THYROXINE SECRETION								÷	
2 to 15 weeks: NH	. —		. 68		1. 18	. 83	5	42	178
VISUAL STIMULUS RESPONSE									
24-hour chicks: WL		. 59	. 74	. 66			4	15	175

Genetic and Phenotypic Correlations Estimates

The reported estimates of genetic and phenotypic correlations are summarized and reported in table 5. The number of estimates reported for many different traits is so large that it precludes the possibility of a reasonable discussion of all of them. In addition, as pointed out in the introduction, the estimates reported vary greatly. For this reason the discussion will be generalized and limited to those genetic correlations for which several estimates have been reported and for which a reasonable estimate of the average can be given.

Body weights taken before sexual maturity show a rather high positive genetic correlation with mature body weights (in the range of 0.52 to 0.68); a positive correlation with pullet egg weight (0.15) and with mature egg weight (0.37); and a small negative correlation with sexual maturity (-0.10), measures of egg production (short-term) (-0.12), and specific gravity (-0.03).

Pullet body weights are positively correlated with both pullet and mature egg weights (0.34 and 0.40), page 34, as are mature body weight (0.29 and 0.36), page 34.

Most estimates of the genetic correlation between sexual maturity and different measures of production are negative but range from -0.96 to +0.58. The correlation of sexual maturity with egg weight is small and positive (0.06 to 0.08), whereas the correlation of sexual maturity with specific gravity is quite high (0.29).

When all measures of egg production are considered, an average of genetic correlations between the traits indicates that egg production shows a small negative correlation with egg weight (about -0.05) but considerably larger negative correlations with Haugh units (about -0.33), specific gravity (about -0.31), and shell thickness (about -0.26).

Egg weight is negatively correlated with albumen quality of pullet eggs (-0.32) and positively correlated with albumen height of eggs of mature hens (0.26); with fresh Haugh units for eggs of mature hens (0.04); and with average specific gravity (0.13) and average shape of eggs of pullets and mature hens (0.19).

Albumen quality shows small negative correlations with specific gravity and egg shape (-0.04 and -0.07). Specific gravity appears to be positively correlated with egg shape (0.12).

Table 5.—Reported estimates of genetic and phenotypic correlations among traits in chickens, by age of chickens

Traits correlated -			Raf	Troits somel-1-1	Correlation		Ref.	
	Ge- netic	Pheno- typic	Ref.	Traits correlated -	Ge- netic	Pheno- typic	Ref.	
BODY WEIGHT				BODY WEIGHT-Con.				
3 weeks and—				8 weeks and—Continued				
6 weeks	0. 91	0. 83	126	Shank pigmentation at			,	
9 weeks 12 weeks	$\frac{.83}{.70}$	$.74 \\ .68$	$126 \\ 126$	8 weeks	 54	 07	202	
				9 weeks and—				
4 weeks and—	0.4	0.0	100	12 weeks	. 98	. 93	126	
8 weeks 8-week breast angle	. 84	. 93	168 167	Pullet body weight Mature body weight	. 69	. 58	62, 130	
Cumulative number of	. 22		107	9-week breast angle	. 62 . 33	. 31	130 48, 130	
matings	. 31	. 07	169	308-day breast angle	. 20	. 01	102	
				308-day keel length	. 73		102	
6 weeks and—				9-week shank length	. 79		102	
9 weeks	. 95	. 93	126, 129, 130	308-day shank length	. 83		103	
12 weeks	. 92	. 62	125, 126	Age at first egg	—. 05	 26	62, 130	
9-week breast angle	. 16		129	Hen housed pro- duction—annual	. 09		130	
9-week keel length	.71		129	Mature egg weight	. 17	. 38	62, 130	
9-week shank length	. 77	-	129	62-day adrenal weight		47	172	
Serum cholesterol level at 6 weeks		 09	191	62-day bursa weight	. 18	. 07	172	
at t weeks		00	101	62-day thyroid weight	33	. 26	172	
011				Semen concentration at				
8 weeks and— Pullet body weight	. 68	. 56	81, 95, 96,	6 to 7 months	. 04		177	
runet body weight	. 03	. 50	168, 203	Sperm motility at 6 to 7 months	91		177	
Mature body weight	. 52	. 43	41, 45, 81,	Semen quantity at 6 to	21		177	
mare soup mergerer		•	86, 95, 96,	7 months	. 08		177	
			145, 168,					
			203	10 weeks and—				
8-week feather score		. 39 . 35	164,173	Mature body weight	. 78	. 40	127	
8-week breast angle Age at first egg	28	. 33 . 07	81, 94, 96,	10-week breast angle	. 65	. 16	11	
Age at mist egg	. 10		97, 168, 203	Age at first egg	. 35	 18	101, 149	
Rate of production:				Survivor production to 319 days >S.M	. 13		101	
Short $\hat{t}erm_{}$	 12	07	41, 81, 95,	Persistency	$. \overset{.}{26}$		101	
			96, 97,	11-week thyroid				
			168, 203, 207	weight	. 68	. 58	35	
34 to 64 weeks of age_	. 65	 02	203	11-week testes weight	. 35	. 40	35	
41 to 55 weeks of age_	. 14	. 02	96	10				
56 to 70 weeks of age	$\tilde{0}$		96	12 weeks and—	70		aa	
64 weeks of age	76	04	203	Pullet body weight Mature body weight	$\frac{.79}{.65}$		23 23	
70 weeks of age	. 11		95, 96	12-week breast width	. 16	. 13	3, 34, 106	
Survivor production:	05		110	12-week keel length	.74	. 80	3, 106	
To 8 months of age	. 05	07	117 86	12-week shank length	. 87	. 66	3, 106	
To 46 weeks of age To 500 days of age	. 15 . 09	07 02	62	Age at first egg		 03	23, 125	
Pullet egg weight	. 15	. 11	95, 96, 203	Pullet egg weight	. 25		23	
Mature egg weight	. 37	$\dot{21}$	45, 81, 95,	Mature egg weight	. 32	. 12	23, 125	
00 0			96, 97,	Survivor production: To 28 weeks of age	. 22		23	
	**	90	168, 203	28 to 36 weeks of age_	. 08		23	
Haugh units	. 12	. 32	168	36 to 44 weeks of age_			23	
Albumen height	. 13	. 02	86	To 46 weeks of age	20	_	34	
Albumen quality— USDA score	-, 21		95, 96	Annual	. 11		23	
Specific gravity	$\bar{03}$	08	95, 96, 168	Hen housed production	_ 17	_	01	
Shape index	. 23		95, 96	to 46 weeks of age	17		34	
Aggressiveness	. 34	. 39	173	Rate of production— annual—————		. 03	125	
Semen volume	. 21	. 51	168	WIIII COLL	-	. 00	120	
Sperm concentration	16		168 168	Pullet and—				
Sperm motility Number of matings	29	36 01	169	Mature body weight	. 91	. 43	23,	
	. 01	. 01	100				96, 197, 203,	
Serum cholesterol level								

Table 5.—Reported estimates of genetic and phenotypic correlations among traits in chickens, by age of chickens.—Continued

Traits correlated -	Correlation		- Ref.	Traits correlated	Corre	elation	D. C
	Ge- netic			Traits correlated	Ge- netic	Pheno- typic	Ref.
BODY WEIGHT-Con.				BODY WEIGHT-Con.			
Pullet and—Continued Age at first egg	. 03	17	7, 23, 30, 62, 63, 68, 95, 96, 203	Mature and—Continued Rate of production— Continued	44	04	
Survivor production: To 250 days of age	. 06		63	34 to 64 weeks of age_ 41 to 55 weeks of age_ 56 to 70 weeks of age_	04	04 	2
To 28 weeks of age	. 10		23	Winter	12	 03	
28 to 36 weeks of age_	. 05		23	64 weeks of age	 06	05	2
36 to 44 weeks of age	03	. 03	23 86	To 70 weeks of age	11		95,
250 to 450 days	30	. 03	63	Annual	. 16	. 17	
To 450 days	16		63	Persistency Pullet egg weight	$\frac{.16}{.29}$. 08	23, 95 , 9
Annual			23	I dhet egg weight	. 29	. 00	23, 90, 9 161, 20
Rate of production:		01	05 00 000	Mature egg weight	. 36	. 23	23, 41, 45, 7
Short term Dec. 1 to March 1		. 01	95, 96, 203 197				78, 88, 8
March 2 to May 31	. 68 . 54		197				91, 95, 9
34 to 64 weeks of age_		05	203				142, 14
41 to 55 weeks of age.	. 15		96	Albumen quality—			197, 2
56 to 70 weeks of age_			96	USDA score	-, 03	_	95, 96, 20
To May 31			197	Albumen height	. 06	. 12	20,00,00
To 64 weeks of age		03	203	Haugh units	. 01	. 16	: 8
To 70 weeks of age	 09		95, 96	Haugh units—fresh	. 17	. 28	
Pullet egg weight	. 34	. 25	7, 23, 40, 95,	Haugh units—stored Haugh unit loss in 2	—. 13	 93	8
			96, 203	weeks	. 69	. 26	,
Mature egg weight	. 40	. 17	23, 30, 62, 63,	Specific gravity	. 09	01	88, 95,
			86, 95, 96,	Shape index	. 05		95, 8
111			197, 203	Shell color Serum cholesterol level:	 06	 03	
Albumen quality—	0.5		07.00	At 6 weeks	_ 37	 03	18
USDA score		05	95, 96	At 8 months		02	18
Albumen height Specific gravity		. 05	86 05 06			• • •	
Shape index		01	95, 96 86, 95, 96	WEIGHT GAIN			
Persistency		01	7				
Mating frequency	. 17	01	169	0 to 3 weeks and—	05	00	
manife modernoù manne		• • •	100	3 to 6 weeks6 to 9 weeks	. 87	. 39	. 4
Mature and—				9 to 12 weeks	- 20	$\begin{array}{c} \cdot 22 \\ \cdot 09 \end{array}$	4
8-week breast angle	. 13	. 16	167		. 20	. 05	٠ .
Age at first egg	. 06	. 12	7, 23, 89, 91,	3 to 6 weeks and—			
			95, 96, 101,	6 to 9 weeks		. 25	4
			149, 161,	9 to 12 weeks	. 47	. 24	4
			203	6 to 9 weeks and—			
Survivor production:				9 to 12 weeks	48	. 01	4
1 month		 12	89				
2 months		08	89	FEATHERING			
3 months		 06	89	10-day back and—			
28 weeks	. 06		23	10-day breast feathering	_	. 53	17
28 to 36 weeks of age_	. 01		23	5-week back feathering.		$\frac{.33}{.28}$	17
36 to 44 weeks of age_ Short term	. 09 51	10	23	7-week back feathering		$.\overline{28}$	17
		10 . 06	89	10-week pinfeathers		08	17
To 11 months of age To 319 day>maturity_	. 07	.00	23, 88	10-week down score		12	17
Annual	. 03	. 11	101	10-day breast and—			
Hen housed production	. 00	. 11	89, 161	5-week back feathering		. 30	17
to 44 weeks of age	. 12	11	78	7-week back feathering.	_	. 29	17
Rate of production:	. 14		10	10-week pinfeathers		17	17
Dec. 1 to Mar. 1	 31		197	10-week down score		 09	17
Mar. 2 to May 31	. 71		197	5-week back and—			
		~~		O-WEEK DACK SHU			
Short term	. 00	. 05	41, 91, 95,	10-week pinfeathers		 10	17

Table 5.—Reported estimates of genetic and phenotypic correlations among traits in chickens, by age of chickens.—Continued

Traits correlated -	Correl	lation	Dof	Traits correlated -	Correlation		· Ref.	
		Pheno- typic	Ref.		Ge- netic	Pheno- typic	Rei.	
FEATHERING—Con.				SEXUAL MATURITY— Continued				
7-week back and— 10-week pinfeathers 10-week down score	_	23 29	170 170	Age of first egg and—Con. Rate of production: Short term	 79	 10	46, 91, 95, 96,	
10-week pinfeathers and— 10-week down score		. 13	170	34 to 64 weeks of age_41 to 55 weeks of age_	 34	. 01	97,203,207 203 96	
Breast feathering and— Breast blisters in broilers	. 50	. 70	58	56 to 70 weeks of age To 60 weeks of age To 64 weeks of age	03 33 . 58		96 30 20 3	
BREAST ANGLE				$egin{array}{lll} { m To}~70~{ m weeks~of~age}_{} \\ { m Annual}_{} \\ { m Pullet~egg~weight}_{} \end{array}$	50	27 23	95, 96 $91, 92$ $7, 23, 95,$	
8-week and— 59-day live weight 59-day eviscerated	. 27	. 38	171	Mature egg weight	. 10	 01	96, 161 2,7,23,39,89, 95, 96, 203	
weight 8-week feathering Age at first egg	. 06 . 08 . 04	. 38 . 07 . 01	171 167 167	Albumen quality— USDA score Haugh units—fresh Haugh units—stored	. 00 . 37	. 32	30, 95, 96 93	
Rate of production— annual Mature egg weight	. 02 . 11	02 . 16	167 167	2 weeks Haugh units loss in		. 31	93 93	
Haugh unit loss in 2 weeks	. 00	. 04	167 167	2 weeks Specific gravity Egg Shape	. 29 . 16	_	95, 96 95, 96	
Specific gravity Semen volume Sperm concentration	. 15	15 . 13 . 22	167 167	Percent blood spots Serum cholesterol level: At 6 weeks	. 33	. 02	39 191	
Sperm motility Number of matings	. 35	01	167 169	At 8 months Persistency		<u>02</u>	$\frac{191}{7}$	
9-week and— Broiler weight			131	SURVIVOR PRODUCTION				
9-week keel length 9-week shank length		_	129, 131 129, 131	To 28 weeks of age and— 28 to 36 weeks of age			23	
12-week breast width and— 12-week shank length		. 38	3, 106	36 to 44 weeks of age To 44 weeks of age Pullet egg weight Mature egg weight	. 70 . 17		23 23 23 23	
KEEL LENGTH 12-week and—				28 to 36 weeks of age				
12-week shank length 12-week breast width		. 52 07	3, 106 3, 106	36 to 44 weeks of age To 44 weeks of age Pullet egg weight Mature egg weight	. 86 . 27		23 23 23 23	
SEXUAL MATURITY Age at first egg and—				36 to 44 weeks of age				
Survivor production: To 28 weeks of age 28 to 36 weeks of age_	32	_	23 23 23	and— To 44 weeks of age Pullet egg weight Mature egg weight	. 13		23 23 23	
36 to 44 weeks of age To 44 weeks of age To 46 weeks of age Winter Short term To 500 days of age	58 58 72 59	<u>48</u>	23 34 2 2 17, 34, 63	Short term and— 400 to 450 days of age 300-day production Too 500 days of age Annual	56	. 50	146	
Annual		20	17, 30, 39, 63, 89, 101, 161	Rate of production— short term Egg mass to January—	91	. 94	187	
Hen housed production: To 46 weeks of age Short term		34	34 185	Pullet egg weight Mature egg weight	24 _ —. 15		23, 29, 63, 69, 78, 89, 187	

Table 5.—Reported estimates of genetic and phenotypic correlations among traits in chickens, by age of chickens.—Continued

Traits correlated	Correlation		- Ref.	Traits correlated	Corre	elation	D 6
	Ge- netic	Pheno- typic		Trans correlated	Ge- netic	Pheno- typic	Ref.
SURVIVOR PRO- DUCTION—Continued				RATE OF PRO- DUCTION—Continued			,
Short term and—Con.				Short term and—Con.			
Albumen quality— USDA score	20	22	29	Annual Pullet egg weight	$\frac{.90}{.45}$	10	95, 96 20
Specific gravity Egg shape	. 09	30 07	29 29, 69	Mature egg weight Albumen quality—	 . 03	. 01	91, 203, 20
Annual and—				USDA score Specific gravity	41		95, 96, 20 95, 96, 20
Winter		. 73	29	Shape index	 10		95, 96, 20
To 500 days of age Annual	. 96 . 73	. 94 . 61	146 146	Annual and—			
Rate of production to				Rate of production to 60			:
60 weeks of age Pauses >6 days	. 83 . 59	_	30 101	weeks of age Mature egg weight	. 91 . 01	. 11	
Pauses <6 days	59		101	Albumen quality—			:
Persistency Pullet egg weight	- 38 - 02	11	101 161	USDA score Haugh units—fresh	00	. 02 . 03	91, 94, 96
Mature egg weight	04	03	7, 29, 62, 63,	Haugh units—stored 2			
			69, 88, 89, 150, 187	weeks Haugh unit loss in 2	 50	. 77	98
Percent blood spots	. 08	. 03	39	weeks	. 36	. 07	93
Percent meat spots Albumen quality—	. 01		118	Specific gravity Shape index	23		94, 96
USDA score		 14	29, 150, 184	Persistency	. 65	_	94, 96 7
Albumen height Haugh units	04	02 21	88				
riaugh units	20	21	50, 88, 139, 150	EGG WEIGHT			
Specific gravity	30	13	29, 88, 136				
Shell thickness Egg shape	20 18	05 05	50, 150, 184 29, 69	Pullet and— Rate or production:			
Yolk color	21		184	34 to 64 weeks of age_	04	. 04	203
Viability Serum cholesterol level	. 67		101	41 to 55 weeks of age 56 to 70 weeks of age	17		96
at 6 weeks	. 37	06	191	Short term	49		96, 96, 151
Serum alkaline phosphatase	. 50	. 01	192	To 64 weeks of age	23	 04	203
		. 01	20%	Annual Mature egg weight	. 83	. 29	95, 96, 7, 23, 95, 96,
HEN HOUSED PRODUCTION				Albumen quality—			203
Short term and—			405	USDA score Specific gravity			95, 96 95, 96
First month Second month	. 69 . 69	. 35 . 93	185 185		. 00		: 00,00
Third month	. 89	. 78	185	Mature and— Survivor production:			
Annual	1. 21	. 65	185	To 46 weeks of age	16	. 01	. 86
RATE OF				Winter	 38		, 2
PRODUCTION				Rate of production: 34 to 64 weeks of age_	07	വാ	ana
34 to 64 weeks of age				41 to 55 weeks of age.	20	. 02	203 96
and— To 64 weeks of age	. 58	. 01	203	56 to 70 weeks of age_	37		96
J	, 00	. 01	200	Short term To 64 weeks of age		05	95, 96, 207 203
41 to 55 weeks of age and—				Annual			95, 96
56 to 70 weeks of age	. 88		96	Albumen quality— USDA score	. 14	. 05	29, 30, 95, 96,
Annual	. 87	_	96				136
Short term and—				Albumen height	. 26	. 31	86, 88, 150, 199
34 to 64 weeks of age 41 to 55 weeks of age	. 67	. 05	203	Haugh units		05	88
56 to 70 weeks of age To 64 weeks of age	$\begin{array}{c} .\ 76 \\ .\ 45 \end{array}$		96 96	Haugh units—fresh Haugh units—stored 2	. 04	. 22	93, 150, 199
	$\overline{.19}$	04	203	weeks	. 02	. 34	

Table 5.—Reported estimates of genetic and phenotypic correlations among traits in chickens, by age of chickens.—Continued

Traits correlated -	Correlation		Dof.	The ite as well-to it	Correlation		D.đ
	Ge- netic	Pheno- typic	Ref.	Traits correlated -	Ge- netic	Pheno- typic	Ref.
EGG WEIGHT—Con.				ALBUMEN—Continued			
Mature and—Continued Haugh unit loss in 2 weeks	. 79	. 43	93	Haugh units and—Con. Haugh units—stored 2 weeks			116
Shell thickness	. 25	. 00	29, 88, 95, 96, 136 150	Shell thickness Specific gravity Shell color	. 21	. 11 . 07 06	50, 199 88 88
Percent blood spots Percent meat spots Egg shape	04	. 00	39 118 29, 69, 86, 95,	Percent hatch: Of fertile eggs Of all eggs	39		50 50
Shell colorYolk weightYolk weight/egg weight	. 83	-06 $.55$ -42	96 76, 88 63 63	Hatching date Serum cholesterol level: At 6 weeks At 8 months		19 05 23	199 191 191
Serum cholesterol level: At 6 weeks At 8 months	 35	07	191 191	Haugh unit loss in 2 weeks		. 20	101
BLOOD SPOTS				Albumen quality— USDA score——— Haugh units—fresh———		. 02 . 36	93 93
Percent and— Rate of production to 60 weeks of age	13	_	30	Haugh units—stored 2 weeks Haugh units—stored/ Haugh units—fresh		42 96	93 93
Shell thickness Serum cholesterol level at 6 weeks		05	115 191	SHELL QUALITY	.00	. 50	00
MEAT SPOTS				Specific gravity and— Rate of production: 41 to 55 weeks	_ 11		96
Percent and— Shell thickness——— Serum cholesterol level at 6 weeks———		. 08	118 191	56 to 70 weeks Egg shape Shell color Shell thickness and—	25 . 12	03 04	96 29, 95, 96 88
ALBUMEN Quality and—				Percent hatch: Of fertile eggs Of all eggs		. 05 . 08	50 50
Rate of production: 41 to 55 weeks of age 56 to 70 weeks of age Albumen quality—	 48		96 96	Shell strength and— Serum cholesterol level: At 6 weeks At 8 months Egg shape and—		. 08 02	191 191
stored Specific gravity Egg shape	04	. 17	136 29, 95, 96, 131 29, 30, 95, 96	Survivor production to 46 weeks Rate of production:	. 12	. 07	86
Serum cholesterol level at 6 weeks	. 23	 04	191	41 to 55 weeks 56 to 70 weeks	. 37 . 25		96 96
Height and— Survivor production: In March—————	 13	24	199	HATCHABILITY			
To 46 weeks of age Percent meat spots Haugh units Specific gravity	16 . 96	. 94	86 118 88, 199 90	Percent hatch of fertile eggs and— Survivor production— October to July	. 30	. 16	7:
Shell thickness Egg shape Hatching date	1. 14	$\begin{array}{c} .15 \\ .20 \end{array}$	150, 199 86 199	Hen housed production—October to July- Hen day production—	. 23		7.
Haugh units and— Survivor production in	. 10	. 00		October to July Current egg production Weeks in production	96	. 05	7. 2. 2.
March Percent meat spots Albumen quality—			199 118 93	Weeks of age Percent inbreeding Fertility Percent hatch of all eggs_	. 36	. 06 . 01 . <u>18</u>	26 26, 144 26, 20

Table 5.—Reported estimates of genetic and phenotypic correlations among traits in chickens, by age of chickens—Continued

Traits correlated	Correlation		Dof	Troita completed	Corre	elation	Ref.	
	Ge- netic	Pheno- typic	Ref.	Traits correlated		Pheno- typic	Rei.	
HATCHABILITY—Con.				APPROACHES—Con.				
Percent hatch of all eggs set and— Fertility—————		. 69	26	Number of abnormal and— Number of crouches Mild avoidances Strong avoidances		. 25 . 12 . 26	204 204 204	
COMB WEIGHT				CROUCHES			•	
Single and— Testes weight	 03	. 07	84	Number and— Mild avoidances		. 51	204	
THYROID				Strong avoidances		. 16	204	
Weight and— 11-week testes weight 62-day adrenal weight	. 40	. 37 02	35 172	SEMEN Appearance score and—				
62-day bursa weight		00	172	Motility score Volume Optical density		$\begin{array}{c} .\ 59 \\ .\ 21 \\ .\ 87 \end{array}$	204 204 204	
BURSA 62-day weight and—	10		100	Sperm count Percent fertility		$\begin{array}{c} .39 \\ .22 \end{array}$	204 204 204	
62-day adrenal weight MATINGS	18	05	172	Volume and— Optical density score		. 26	204	
Number of completed and—				Sperm motility Sperm count Percent fertility		. 12 . 15	177 204 204	
Number of courts Number of courts Number of mounts Number of treads	. 36 . 71 . 82	. 54 . 60 . 94 . 97	204 169 169 169	Optical density and— Sperm count Percent fertility		. 48 . 20	204 204	
Relative aggressiveness_ Number of normal approaches		. 09 . 91	169 204	Quantity and— Sperm concentration			177 177	
Number of abnormal approachesSemen appearance score. 1. Sperm motility 2. Sperm motility	. 23	. 30 . 13 . 03 . 01	204 204 204 169	Sperm motilitySPERM Motility and—	. 04		177	
3. Semen volume	38 38 67	. 07 04 . 15 . 01	204 169 204 169	VolumeOptical density Sperm count Percent fertility	04	. 12 . 57 . 38 . 31	204 204 177, 204 204	
Mild avoidances Strong avoidances Percent fertility	_	. 48	204 204 204 204	Count and— Sperm motility Percent fertility	. 51	. 04	177 204	
COURTS				Concentration and— Sperm motility————	. 51		177	
Number and— Number of normal ap- proaches		. 44	204	MORTALITY	.01		171	
Number of abnormal approaches Number of crouches		. 17	204 204	Adult and— Hen housed produc-				
Mild avoidances Strong avoidances			204 204 204	tion—October to July_ Hen day production— October to July		22 67	71 71	
APPROACHES				Hen day production to 365 days > S.M Total leucosis mortality_		. 14	144 118	
Number of normal and— Number of abnormal		00	**	Total nonleucosis mortality	. 83		113	
approaches Number of crouches Mild avoidances Strong avoidances		. 22 . 63 . 44 . 39	204 204 204 204	Total mortality Broodiness Percent hatch of fertiles_	. 03	05	113 145 71	

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The extreme variability of reported estimates is perhaps one of the most obvious features of a summary of reported heritability and of genetic or phenotypic correlation estimates. Standard errors of estimates are usually large, even where estimates are made from large populations. For this reason, the value of estimates of these parameters in a specific population is questionable to one interested in a genetically different population.

Another feature that is obvious from a review of the literature on genetic parameter estimates is lack of information regarding the importance of genotype environment interactions and maternal, dominance, epistatic, or other effects that may or may not be important in the genetic study of various traits. These effects have been expeditiously handled in many cases simply by assuming that they are negligible or do not exist. It seems that more studies designed to estimate the importance of these effects would be well justified.

It seems reasonable to conclude that sufficient estimates of the heritability of body weights, egg

weights, sexual maturity, and measures of egg production have been reported so that averages provide meaningful estimates of expected values of this parameter. For most other traits reported estimates are too few to provide meaningful approximations of the heritability. Additional estimates would be of some value. However, it does not seem that studies designed to estimate heritability are justified unless they are a byproduct of a selection experiment or some other genetic study.

For reasons discussed earlier, individual estimates of genetic or phenotypic correlations are of little value except as they relate to a specific genetic study. If a very large number of these are reported for any two traits, averages would provide an expected value for the parameters but these approximations would be quite unreliable. Thus, although reported estimates of genetic or phenotypic correlations are of some general interest, they are of principal value as they relate to specific populations and should be recognized as such.

REFERENCES

- (1) ABPLANALP, HANS.
 1956. SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR POUL-TRY FLOCKS WITH MANY HATCHES.
 Poultry Sci. 35: 1285-1304.
- (3) —— Asmundson, V. S., and Lerner, I. M.
 - 1960. EXPERIMENTAL TESTS OF A SELECTION INDEX. Poultry Sci. 39: 151-160.
- (4) —— LOWRY, D. C., LERNER, I. M., and DEMPSTER, E. R. 1964. SELECTION FOR EGG NUMBER WITH
 - x-ray induced variation. Genetics 50: 1083-1100.
- (5) AMER, M. F.
 1965. HERITABILITY OF BODY WEIGHT
 IN FAYOUMI. Poultry Sci. 44:
 741-744.

- (7) Baczkowska, H., and Kaminska, B.
 1964. Genetic environmental and
 phenotypic correlations between some economic characters in laying hens. (Abstract) Anim. Breeding Abs.
 33: 3772.
- (8) —— Kaminska, B., and Freundlick,
 A.
 1963. Studies on the Heritability of
 SOME CHARACTERS OF ECONOMIC
 IMPORTANCE IN LAYING HENS
 BASED ON MATERIAL FROM TWO
 BREEDING FARMS. (Abstract)
 Anim. Breeding Abs. 32: 3412.
- (9) Becker, W. A.
 1964. HERITABILITY OF A RESPONSE TO
 AN ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE IN
 CHICKENS. Genetics 50: 783788.
- (10) and Berg, L. R.

 1960. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE
 NUTRITIONAL ENVIRONMENT AND
 SELECTION FOR BODY WEIGHT.
 (Abstract) Poultry Sci. 39: 1234.

(11) Beilharz, R. G., and McDonald, M. W. 1961. A comparison of white leghorns, australorps and their reciprocal crosses. Austral. Jour. Agr. Res. 12: 539-546.

(12) BLOW, W. L., BOSTIAN, C. H., and GLAZE-

NER, E. W.

1950. THE INHERITANCE OF EGG SHELL color. Poultry Sci. 29: 381-385.

(13) BOHREN, B. B., HILL, W. G., and ROBERT-SON, A.

1966. SOME OBSERVATIONS ON ASYMMETRICAL CORRELATED RESPONSES TO SELECTION. Genet. Res. 7: 44-57.

(14) BOWER, R. K.

1962. A QUANTITATION OF THE INFLUENCE OF THE CHICK EMBRYO GENOTYPE ON TUMOR PRODUCTION BY ROUS SARCOMA VIRUS ON THE CHORIOALLANTOIC MEMBRANE. Virology 18: 372-377.

(15) BOYER, J. P., DELAAGE, X., and CALET, C.
1963. INFLUENCE OF FEED ON THE HERITABILITY OF SOME CHICKEN
TRAITS. (Abstract) 11th Internatl. Cong. Genet. I, Proc., p.

262.

(16) Brandsch, H.
1961. HERITABILITY AND SELECTION IN
PREDIGREE POULTRY BREEDING
IN AN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION COOPERATIVE. (Abstract)

Anim. Breeding Abs. 29: 2363. Bray, D. F., King, S. C., and Anderson,

V. Ĺ.

(17)

1960. SEXUAL MATURITY AND THE MEAS-UREMENT OF EGG PRODUCTION. Poultry Sci. 39: 590-601.

(18) Brunson, C. C., Godfrey, G. F., and Goodman, B. L.

1955. HERITABILITY ESTIMATES OF HATCH-ABILITY AND RESISTANCE TO DEATH TO TEN WEEKS OF AGE. (Abstract) Poultry Sci. 34: 1182.

(19) GODFREY, G.F., and GOODMAN, B.L.

1955. TYPES OF GENE ACTION IN THE
INHERITANCE OF TEN WEEK BODY
WEIGHT AND BREAST ANGLE IN
BROILERS. (Abstract) Poultry
Sci. 34: 1183.

(20) — GODFREY, G. F., and GOODMAN, B. L.

1956. HERITABILITY OF ALL-OR-NONE TRAITS. HATCHABILITY AND RESISTANCE TO DEATH TO TEN WEEKS OF AGE. Poultry Sci. 35: 516-523.

(21) — Godfrey, G. F., and Goodman,

1956. TYPES OF GENE ACTION IN THE INHERITANCE OF TEN-WEEK BODY WEIGHT AND BREAST ANGLE IN BROILERS. Poultry Sci. 35: 524-532.

(22) CHERMS, F. L., JR., WILCOX, F. H., and SHOFFNER, C. S.

1960. GENETIC STUDIES OF SERUM CHO-LESTEROL LEVEL IN THE CHICK-EN. Poultry Sci. 39: 889-892.

(23) CLAYTON, G. A., and ROBERTSON, A.
1966. GENETICS OF CHANGES IN ECONOMIC TRAITS DURING THE LAYING YEAR. Brit. Poultry Sci.
7: 143-151.

(24) CRITTENDEN, L. B., and BOHREN, B. B.
1961. THE GENETIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL
EFFECTS OF HATCHING TIME, EGG
WEIGHT AND HOLDING TIME ON
HATCHABILITY. Poultry Sci. 40:
1736-1750.

(25) and Bohren, B. B.

1962. THE EFFECTS OF CURRENT EGG
PRODUCTION, TIME IN PRODUCTION, AGE OF PULLET AND INBREEDING ON HATCHABILITY AND
HATCHING TIME. Poultry Sci.
41: 426-433.

(26) W. L.
1957. GENETIC VARIANCE AND COVARIANCE OF THE COMPONENTS OF

HATCHABILITY IN NEW HAMP-SHIRES. Poultry Sci. 36: 90-

103.

(27) DAVIS, G. T.
1955. INFLUENCE OF OXYGEN CONCENTRATION ON HATCHABILITY AND ON SELECTING FOR HATCHABILITY. Poultry Sci. 34: 107-113.

(28) DEMPSTER, E. R., LERNER, I. M., and LOWRY, D. C.

1952. CONTINUOUS SELECTION FOR EGG PRODUCTION IN POULTRY. Genetics 37: 693-708.

(29) DICKERSON, G. E.
1955. GENETIC SLIPPAGE IN RESPONSE
TO SELECTION FOR MULTIPLE
OBJECTIVES. Cold Spring Harbor Symp. Quantitative Biol.
20: 213-224.

(32)

1960. TECHNIQUES FOR RESEARCH IN
QUANTITATIVE ANIMAL GENETICS.
TECHNIQUES AND PROCEDURES
IN ANIMAL PRODUCTION RESEARCH. pp. 56-105. New York.

(33) —— and Lamareaux, W. F.
1954. REPEATABILITY AND HERITABILITY
OF ALBUMEN QUALITY IN WHITE
LEGHORNS. (Abstract) Poultry
Sci. 33: 1053.

(34) DILLARD, E. U., DICKERSON, G. E., and LAMAREAUX, W. F.

1953. HERITABILITIES OF EGG AND MEAT PRODUCTION QUANTITIES AND THEIR GENETIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL RELATIONSHIPS IN NEW HAMPSHIRE PULLETS. (Abstract) Poultry Sci. 32: 897.

(35) EL-IBIARY, H. M., and SHOFFNER, C. S. 1951. THE EFFECT OF INDUCED HYPO-THYROIDISM ON THE GENETICS OF GROWTH IN THE CHICKEN. Poultry Sci. 30: 435-444.

(36) Erasmus, J. E.
1965. SELEKSIE VIR 12-WEKE LIGGAAMSGEWIG BY KUIKENS. South African

Jour. Agr. Sci. 8: 831–837.

(37) FALCONER, D. S.

1960. INTRODUCTION TO QUANTITATIVE GENETICS. 370 pp., illus. New York.

(38) Farnsworth, G. M. and Nordskog, A. W. 1955. Breeding for egg quality. 3. Genetic differences in shell characteristics and other egg quality characteristics. Poultry Sci. 34: 16-26.

(39) and Nordskog, A. W.

1955. ESTIMATES OF GENETIC PARAMETERS INFLUENCING BLOOD SPOTS AND OTHER ECONOMIC TRAITS OF THE FOWL. (Abstract) Poultry Sci. 34: 1192.

(40) Festing, M. F., and Nordskog, A. W. 1967. RESPONSE TO SELECTION FOR BODY WEIGHT AND EGG WEIGHT IN CHICKENS. Genetics 55: 219-231.

(41) Friars, G. W., Bohren, B. B., and McKean, H. E.

1962. TIME TRENDS IN ESTIMATES OF GENETIC PARAMETERS IN A POPULATION OF CHICKENS SUBJECTED TO MULTIPLE OBJECTIVE SELECTION. Poultry Sci. 41: 1773-1784.

(42) Fuchs, M. H., and Krueger, W. F.
1957. A COMPARISON OF THE GENETIC
VARIANCE OF PUREBRED AND
STRAIN CROSS WHITE LEGHORNS.
(Abstract) Poultry Sci. 36: 1120.

(43) GAFFNEY, L. T.

1964. STUDIES ON GROWTH RATE AND ESTIMATES OF THE HERITABILITY OF BODY WEIGHT IN BROILER STOCK. Austral. Poultry Sci. Conv. Proc., pp. 74–78.

(44) Garber, M. J., and Godbey, C. B.

1952. The influence of sire, dam and hatching date on specific rate of growth of single comb white leghorn pullets from hatching to twelve weeks of age. Poultry Sci. 31: 945-955.

(45) GHOSTLEY, J. E., and NORDSKOG, A. W. 1956. EFFICIENCY OF INDEX SELECTION FOR EGG WEIGHT AND FOR GROWTH RATE. (Abstract) Poultry Sci. 35: 1144.

(46) GIESBRECHT, F. G., and Nordskog, A. W. 1963. ESTIMATING AGE AT SEXUAL MATURITY FROM FLOCK RECORDS. Poultry Sci. 42: 83-87.

(47) GILBREATH, J. C., WELCH, Q. B., and MORRISON, R. D.

1962. EFFECTS OF SELECTION AND OUTBREEDING ON HATCHABILITY IN CHICKENS. Okla. Agr. Expt. Sta. Tech. Bul. T-96, 12 pp. Godfrey, G. F., and Goodman, B. L.

(48) Godfrey, G. F., and Goodman, B. L.
1956. GENETIC VARIATION AND COVARIATION IN BROILER BODY WEIGHT
AND BREAST WIDTH. Poultry
Sci. 35: 47-50.

(49) — GOODMAN, B. L., and NEWELL,

1954. REPEATABILITY AND HERITABILITY ESTIMATES OF ALBUMEN QUALITY. (Abstract) Poultry Sci.33: 1056.

(50) GOODMAN, B. L., and GODFREY, G. F.
1955. GENETIC, PHENOTYPIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SOME EGG QUALITY TRAITS
AND EGG PRODUCTION AND
HATCHABILITY. (Abstract)
Poultry Sci. 34: 1197.

(51) —— and Godfrey, G. F.
1956. HERITABILITY OF BODY WEIGHT IN
THE DOMESTIC FOWL. Poultry

Sci. 35: 50-53.
(52) ———— GRIMES, J. F., and JAAP, R. G.

1957. REPEATABILITY ESTIMATES OF
GENETIC VARIANCE WITHIN TWO
CLOSED-FLOCK STRAINS. (Abstract) Poultry Sci. 36: 1121.

- (53) GOODMAN, B. L., and JAAP, R. G.
 1960. IMPROVING ACCURACY OF HERITABILITY ESTIMATES FROM DIALLEL
 AND TRIALLEL MATINGS IN POULTRY. 1. EIGHT-WEEK BODY
 WEIGHT IN CLOSED FLOCK
 STRAINS. Poultry Sci. 39: 938943.
- (54) and Jaap, R. G.

 1960. IMPROVING ACCURACY OF HERITABILITY ESTIMATES FROM DIALLEL
 AND TRIALLEL MATINGS IN
 POULTRY. 2. WEIGHT OF SPLEEN
 AND BURSA OF FABRICIUS IN A
 RANDOMBRED POPULATION.
 Poultry Sci. 39: 944-949.
- (55) —— and Jaap, R. G.

 1961. NON-ADDITIVE AND SEX-LINKED
 GENETIC EFFECTS ON EGG PRODUCTION IN A RANDOMBRED POPULATION. Poultry Sci. 40: 662668.
- (56) Gowe, R. S., Budde, H. W., and McGann, P. J.

 1965. ON MEASURING EGG SHELL COLOR
 IN POULTRY BREEDING AND SELECTION PROGRAMS. Poultry
 Sci. 44: 264–270.
- (57) Guhl, A. M., Craig, J. V., and Mueller, C. D.
 1960. Selective breeding for aggressiveness in chickens. Poultry

Sci. 39: 970–980.

- (58) Gyles, N. R., Kan, J., and Smith, R. M. 1962. The Heritability of Breast Blister condition and Breast Feather coverage in a white Rock Broiler Strain. Poultry Sci. 41: 13-17.
- (59) Hale, R. W.
 1954. Heritability of chick viability
 IN A WHITE WYANDOTTE FLOCK.
 Jour. Agr. Sci. 44: 221–226.
- (61)

 1961. GENOTYPE-ENVIRONMENT INTERACTIONS IN A COMPARISON OF THE CAGE AND SEMI-INTENSIVE SYSTEMS FOR LAYING HENS. Brit. Poultry Sci. 2: 145–157.
- (62)

 1961. HERITABILITIES AND GENETIC CORRELATIONS OF EGG PRODUCTION
 AND OTHER CHARACTERS IN A
 WHITE WYANDOTTE FLOCK.
 Anim. Prod. 3: 73-87.

- (63) —— and Clayton, G. A.

 1965. A DIALLEL CROSSING EXPERIMENT
 WITH TWO BREEDS OF LAYING
 FOWL. Brit. Poultry Sci. 6:
- 153-174.

 (64) HAYS, F. A.

 1951. FURTHER STUDIES ON ENVIRONMENTAL AND HEREDITARY
 FACTORS AFFECTING WINTER
 PAUSE INCIDENCE AND DURA-

TION. Poultry Sci. 30: 100–105.

- (67) HAZEL, L. N.
 1943. THE GENETIC BASIS FOR CONSTRUCTING SELECTION INDEXES.
 Genetics 28: 476-490.
- (68) —— and Lamareaux, W. F.

 1947. HERITABILITY OF MATERNAL EFFECTS AND NICKING IN RELATION
 TO SEXUAL MATURITY AND BODY
 WEIGHT IN WHITE LEGHORNS.
 Poultry Sci. 26: 508-514.
- (69) Hicks, A. F., Jr.

 1958. Heritability and correlation
 Analyses of egg weight, egg
 shape and egg number in
 chickens. Poultry Sci. 37:
 967-975.
- (70) Buss, E. G., and Maw, A. J. G.

 1961. THE HERITABILITIES OF SEASONALLY DETERMINED EGG QUALITY
 TRAITS. Poultry Sci. 40: 821822.
- (71) HILL, J. F., DICKERSON, G. E., and KEMPSTER, H. L.
 - 1954. SOME RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN
 HATCHABILITY, EGG PRODUCTION
 AND ADULT MORTALITY. (Abstract) Poultry Sci. 33: 1059.
- (72) Hogsett, M. L., and Nordskog, A. W. 1958. Genetic-economic value in selecting for egg production rate, body weight and egg weight. Poultry Sci. 37: 1404–1419.
- (73) Von Krosigk, C. M., and McClary, C. F.
 - 1964. GENETIC AND PHENOTYPIC VARIANCE-COVARIANCE ESTIMATES
 AND THEIR APPLICATION TO
 INDEX-RECIPROCAL RECURRENT
 SELECTION FOR EGG PRODUCTION. (Abstract) Poultry Sci.
 43: 1329.

- (74) Horton, I. F., and McBride, G.
 1964. Genetic factors affecting sex
 DIMORPHISM IN BODY WEIGHT OF
 MEAT CHICKENS. Austral. Poultry Sci. Conv. Proc. pp. 79-81.
- (75) Hunton, P.
 1962. Genetics of egg shell colour
 in a light sussex flock. Brit.
 Poultry Sci. 3: 189-193.
- (77) Hurnik, J.
 1963. The heritability of some productive characters in poultry. (Abstract) Anim. Breeding Abs. 32: 577.
- (79) Hurry, H. F., and Nordskog, A. W.
 1953. A GENETIC ANALYSIS OF CHICK
 FEATHERING AND ITS INFLUENCE
 ON GROWTH RATE. Poultry Sci.
 32: 18-25.
- (80) IDETA, G., and SIEGEL, P. B.
 1966. SELECTION FOR BODY WEIGHT AT
 EIGHT WEEKS OF AGE. 3. REALIZED HERITABILITIES OF UNSELECTED TRAITS. Poultry Sci.
 45: 923-932.
- (81) —— and Siegel, P. B.

 1966. SELECTION FOR BODY WEIGHT AT
 EIGHT WEEKS OF AGE. 4. PHENOTYPIC, GENETIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN
 SELECTED AND UNSELECTED
 TRAITS. Poultry Sci. 45: 933939.
- (82) Jaap, R. G.
 1960. HERITABILITIES, GENE INTERACTION AND CORRELATIONS FOR GROWTH OF GLANDS ASSOCIATED WITH ANTIBODY FORMATION IN THE YOUNG CHICKEN. Poultry Sci. 39: 557-560.

- (84) MURRAY, M. W., and TEMPLE, R. W.

 1961. THE GENETIC CONTROL OF VARIANCE IN COMB AND TESTES WEIGHT OF YOUNG MALE CHICKENS. Poultry Sci. 40: 354—
- (85) —— and Smith, J. H.

 1959. SELECTION FOR RAPIDITY OF
 GROWTH. (Abstract) Poultry
 Sci. 38: 1215.

363.

- (86) ——— SMITH, J. H., and GOODMAN, B. L.

 1962. A GENETIC ANALYSIS OF GROWTH
 AND EGG PRODUCTION IN MEATTYPE CHICKENS. Poultry Sci.
 41: 1439-1446.
- (87) Jaffe, W. P.
 1964. The relationship between egg
 Weight and Yolk Weight.
 Brit. Poultry Sci. 5: 295–298.
- (89) Jerome, F. N., Henderson, C. R., and King, S. C.
 1956. Heritabilities, gene interactions and correlations associated with certain traits in the domestic fowl. Poultry Sci. 35: 995–1013.
- (90) Johnson, A. S., and Merritt, E. S.
 1955. Heritability of albumen height
 And specific gravity of eggs
 from white leghorns and
 Barred rocks and the correlations of these traits
 with egg production. Poultry
 Sci. 34: 578-587.
- (91) King, S. C.
 1961. INHERITANCE OF ECONOMIC TRAITS
 IN THE REGIONAL CORNELL CONTROL POPULATION. Poultry Sci.
 40: 975–986.
- (92) and Henderson, C. R.

 1954. HERITABILITY STUDIES OF EGG PRODUCTION IN THE DOMESTIC FOWL.
 Poultry Sci. 33: 155–169.
- (93) MITCHELL, J. D., KYLE, W. H., and STADELMAN, W. J.

 1961. EGG QUALITY GENETIC VARIATION
 AND COVARIATION. Poultry Sci.
 40: 965-975.

(102)

(94) King, S. C., Van Vleck, L. D., and Doolittle, D. P.
1963. Genetic stability of the cornell randombred control population of white leghorns. Genet. Res. 4: 290–304.

(95) Kinney, T. B., Jr., and Lowe, P. C.
1968. GENETIC AND PHENOTYPIC VARIATION IN THE REGIONAL RED
CONTROLS OVER NINE YEARS.
Poultry Sci. 47: 105-110.

(96) — Lowe, P. C., Bohren, B. B., and Wilson, S. P.

1968. GENETIC AND PHENOTYPIC VARIATION IN RANDOMBRED WHITE LEGHORN CONTROLS OVER SEVERAL GENERATIONS. Poultry Sci. 47: 113-123.

(97) and Shoffner, R. N.

1965. HERITABILITY ESTIMATES AND GENETIC CORRELATIONS AMONG
SEVERAL TRAITS IN A MEAT
TYPE POULTRY POPULATION.
Poultry Sci. 44: 1020-1032.

Poultry Sci. 44: 1020-1032.

(98) Komai, T., Craig, J. V., and Wearden, S.
1959. Heritability and repeatability

of social aggressiveness in

the domestic chicken. Poultry Sci. 38: 356-359.

(99) Kosin, I. L.
1957. A GENETIC ANALYSIS OF EGG SHAPE
IN CHICKENS AND TURKEYS.
(Abstract) Poultry Sci. 36:
1134.

(100) Krause, E., Yamada, Y., and Bell, A. E.
1965. Genetic parameters in two populations of chickens under
reciprocal recurrent selection. Brit. Poultry Sci. 6:
197-206.

(101) KRUEGER, W. F., DICKERSON, G. E., KINDER, Q. B., and KEMPSTER, H. L. 1952. THE GENETIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL RELATIONSHIP OF TOTAL EGG PRODUCTION TO ITS COMPONENTS AND TO BODY WEIGHTS IN THE

DOMESTIC FOWL. (Abstract)
Poultry Sci. 31: 922.

- HILL, A. T., MALIK, D. D., and

Ward, N. C.
1963. THE HERITABILITY OF THE ALBUMEN-YOLK RATIO IN LEGHORNS.
(Abstract) Poultry Sci. 42: 1283.

(103) Kyle, W. H., and Mitchell, J. D.
1958. HERITABILITY OF THE CHANGE IN
EGG QUALITY DURING STORAGE.
(Abstract) Poultry Sci. 37: 1219.

(104) LePore, P. D.
1965. Heritability estimates for
HEMOGLOBIN AND SERUM PROTEIN CONCENTRATION IN GROWING CHICKENS. (Abstract)
Poultry Sci. 44: 1393.

(105) Lerner, I. M.
1958. THE GENETIC BASIS OF SELECTION.
298 pp., illus. New York.

(106) — ASMUNDSON, V. S., and CRUDEN, D. M.

1947. THE IMPROVEMENT OF NEW HAMP-SHIRE FRYERS. Poultry Sci. 26: 515-524.

(107) —— and Cruden, D. M.

1948. THE HERITABILITY OF ACCUMULATIVE MONTHLY AND ANNUAL EGG
PRODUCTION. Poultry Sci. 27:
67-78.

(108) —— and Cruden, D. M.

1950. THE HERITABILITY OF EGG WEIGHT.

THE ADVANTAGES OF MASS SELECTION AND OF EARLY MEASUREMENTS. Poultry Sci. 30:

34-41.

(109) and Dempster, E. R.

1951. ATTENUATION OF GENETIC PROGRESS UNDER CONTINUED SELECTION IN POULTRY. Heredity 5: 75-94.

(110) —— and Hazel, L. N.
1947. POPULATION GENETICS OF A POULTRY FLOCK UNDER ARTIFICIAL
SELECTION. Genetics 32: 325339.

(111) Lowry, D. C., Lerner, I. M., and Taylor, L. W.
1956. INTRA-FLOCK GENETIC MERIT UNDER FLOOR AND CAGE MANAGEMENTS. Poultry Sci. 35: 1034-1043.

(112) Lush, J. L.
1948. The genetics of populations.
381 pp. Ames, Iowa. [Mimeo. book, Iowa State College.]

(113) —— LAMAREAUX, W. F., and HAZEL, L. N.
1948. THE HERITABILITY OF RESISTANCE
TO DEATH IN THE FOWL. Poultry Sci. 27: 375-388.

(114) McBride, G.
1962. The interactions between genotypes and housing environments in the domestic hen.
Austral. Soc. Anim. Prod. Proc.
4:95-102.

(115) McClary, C. F., and Bearse, G. E.
1954. An apparent genetic correlation between egg shell thickness and blood spot incidence in chicken eggs. (Abstract)
Poultry Sci. 33: 1070.

(116) —— and Bearse, G. E.

1956. THE GENETIC CORRELATION OF ALBUMEN QUALITY IN FRESH AND STORED EGGS. (Abstract) Poultry Sci. 35: 1157.

(117) McClung, M. R.
1958. HERITABILITY OF AND GENETIC CORRELATIONS BETWEEN GROWTH
RATE AND EGG PRODUCTION IN
MEAT TYPE CHICKENS. (Abstract) Poultry Sci. 37: 1225.

(120) —— and Durfee, W. K.

1964. SELECTION FOR LOW MEAT SPOT
INCIDENCE IN A BROWN EGG
BREED. Poultry Sci. 43: 1515–
1525.

(121) — MILLAR, R. I., and DURFEE, W. K.
1959. HERITABILITY OF THE CHANGE IN
ALBUMEN HEIGHT DURING STORAGE. (Abstract) Poultry Sci.
38: 1227.

(122) Mahmoud, H. M., Krueger, W. F., Bradley, J. W., and Quisenberry, J. H. 1965. Heritability of eight-week body

WEIGHT UNDER TWO ENVIRON-MENTS AND RELATED GENE ENVI-RONMENT INTERACTIONS. (Abstract) Poultry Sci. 44: 1395.

(123) MALONEY, M. A., Jr., and GILBREATH, J. C.
1966. SELECTION FOR DIFFERENTIAL BODY WEIGHT AT TWELVE WEEKS OF AGE IN THE DOMESTIC FOWL. (Abstract) Poultry Sci. 45: 1102.

(124) — GILBREATH, J. C., and MORRISON, R. D.

1963. TWO-WAY SELECTION FOR BODY WEIGHT IN CHICKENS. 1. THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SELECTION FOR TWELVE-WEEK BODY WEIGHT. Poultry Sci. 42: 326-334.

(125) —— GILBREATH, J. C., and Morrison, R. D.

1963. TWO-WAY SELECTION FOR BODY WEIGHT IN CHICKENS. 2. THE EFFECT OF SELECTION FOR BODY WEIGHT ON OTHER TRAITS. Poultry Sci. 42: 334-344.

(126) MARTIN, G. A., GLAZENER, E. W., and Blow, W. L.

1953. EFFICIENCY OF SELECTION FOR BROILER GROWTH AT VARIOUS AGES. Poultry Sci. 32: 716-720.

(127) Mazanowski, A.

1965. INVESTIGATIONS ON THE INFLUENCE OF THE HERITABILITY INDEX ON BREEDING PROGRESS IN A POPULATION OF LEGHORN.

(Abstract) Anim. Breeding Abs.

33: 3797.

(128) Merat, P.
1960. Heritability of Winter Laying
in pullets with and without
supplementary lighting.
(Abstract) Anim. Breeding Abs.
29: 2369.

(129) Merritt, E. S.
1966. Estimates by sex of genetic
Parameters for body weight
And skeletal dimensions in a
Random bred strain of meat
Type fowl. Poultry Sci. 45:
118-125.

(130) —— and Gowe, R. S.

1962. DEVELOPMENT AND GENETIC PROPERTIES OF A CONTROL STRAIN OF MEAT-TYPE FOWL. XII World's Poultry Cong. Proc., pp. 66-70.

(131) —— ZAWALSKY, M., GORRILL, A. D. L., and others.

1963. CORRELATED CHANGES IN SKELETAL DIMENSIONS OF BROILER CHICKENS SELECTED FOR WIDTH

of Breast. (Abstract) Canad.
Jour. Genet. and Cytol. 5: 104.
(132) Mohapatra, S. C., and Siegel, P. B.
1966. Genetic variation of prothrombin time in chickens.

(Abstract) Poultry Sci. 46:1294.

(133) Morris, J. A.

1956. Genetic parameters associated with characters affecting egg production in the domestic fowl. II. Heritability of egg production for two part-annual periods of measurement and the genetic correlation between them. Austral. Jour. Agr. Res. 7: 630-639.

- (134) Morris, J. A.
 1959. Heritability of Chick Viability
 For two breeds of domestic
 Fowl. Poultry Sci. 38: 481485.
- (136)

 1964. ESTIMATES OF GENETIC PARAMETERS RELEVANT IN SELECTION FOR CERTAIN ASPECTS OF EGG QUALITY. Austral. Jour. Agr. Res. 15: 719–727.
- (137) Moyer, S. E., and Collins, W. M.
 1960. HERITABILITY OF INTENSITY OF
 YELLOW SHANK PIGMENTATION IN
 CROSS-BRED BROILER PROGENY.
 Poultry Sci. 39: 662-663.
- (138) Collins, W. M., and Skoglund, W. C.

 1962. HERITABILITY OF BODY WEIGHT AT

 THREE AGES IN CROSS-BRED

 BROILER CHICKENS RESULTING

 FROM TWO SYSTEMS OF BREED
 ING. Poultry Sci. 41: 1374
 1382.
- (139) Muir, F. V., and Goodman, B. L. 1964. Heritability of dressing percentage in broilers. Poultry Sci. 43: 1605–1606.
- (140) Nestor, K. E., and Jaap, R. G.
 1965. SELECTION FOR COMB WEIGHT WITH
 ANDROGEN AND GONADOTROPHIN STIMULATION. Poultry Sci.
 44: 1441-1451.
- (141) NIGHTALL, E. W.
 1956. A STUDY OF THE INCIDENCE OF
 LYMPHOMATOSIS IN POULTRY
 KEPT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF
 NOTTINGHAM SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE. Poultry Sci. 35: 109125.
- (142) Nordskog, A. W., and Festing, M.
 1962. Selection and correlated responses in the fowl. XII
 World's Poultry Cong. Proc.,
 pp. 25-29.
- (143) ——Festing, M., and Verghese, M. W.
 1967. SELECTION FOR EGG PRODUCTION
 AND CORRELATED RESPONSES IN
 THE FOWL. Genetics 55: 179–
 191.
- (144) —— and Hill, J. F.

 1958. CORRELATION BETWEEN EGG PRODUCTION AND ADULT VIABILITY
 IN HYBRID FLOCKS. Poultry Sci.
 37: 1265–1273.

- (145) ——— SMITH, L. T., and PHILLIPS, R. E.
 1959. HETEROSIS IN POULTRY. 2. CROSS-BREDS VERSUS TOP-CROSSBREDS.
 Poultry Sci. 38: 1372–1380.
- (146) OLIVER, M. M., BOHREN, B. B., and ANDERSON, V. L.

 1957. HERITABILITY AND SELECTION EFFICIENCY OF SEVERAL MEASURES OF EGG PRODUCTION. Poultry Sci. 36: 395–402.
- (147) Onishi, N.
 1954. On the inheritance of sexual
 MATURITY IN SINGLE COMB
 WHITE LEGHORNS. X World's
 Poultry Cong. Proc., pp. 30-33.
- (148) Orozco, P. F.
 1962. COEFFICIENTS OF HERITABILITY FOR
 TWO TRAITS IN TWO STRAINS OF
 WHITE LEGHORNS. (Abstract)
 Anim. Breeding Abs. 31: 1557.
- (149) PEELER, R. J., GLAZENER, E. W., and Blow, W. L.
 1955. THE HERITABILITY OF BROILER WEIGHT AND WEIGHT AND AGE AT SEXUAL MATURITY AND THE GENETIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL CORRELATIONS BETWEEN THESE TRAITS. Poultry Sci. 34: 420–426.
- (150) Quinn, J. P.
 1963. ESTIMATES OF SOME GENETIC PARAMETERS OF EGG QUALITY.
 Poultry Sci. 42: 792-795.
- (151) Redman, C. E., and Shoffner, R. N.
 1961. Estimates of egg quality parameters utilizing a polyallel crossing system. Poultry Sci. 40: 1662-1675.
- (152) Reta, G., Bohren, B. B., and Moses, H. E.

 1963. SIRE AND DAM EFFECTS ON HEMAGGLUTINATION TITERS IN AVIAN EGGS FOLLOWING INOCULATION WITH NEWCASTLE DISEASE VIRUS. Poultry Sci. 42: 1182-1187.
- (153) Rico, M.
 1962. INHERITANCE OF QUANTITATIVE
 CHARACTERS IN THE SPECIES
 GALLUS DOMESTICUS. 1. HERITABILITY OF EGG PRODUCTION,
 EGG WEIGHT AND BODY WEIGHT.
 (Abstract) Anim. Breeding
 Abs. 32: 2453.
- (154) ROBERTSON, A., and LERNER, I. M.
 1949. THE HERITABILITY OF ALL-OR-NONE
 TRAITS: VIABILITY IN POULTRY.
 Genetics 34: 395-411.

- (155) Rodero, A., and Martinez de Miguel, R.
 1961. Heritability of body weight in
 BLACK CASTILIAN, FRANCISCAN
 UTRERA AND WHITE LEGHORN
 PULLETS. (Abstract) Anim.
 Breeding Abs. 31:703.
- (156) Saeki, Y.
 1957. INHERITANCE OF BROODINESS IN
 JAPANESE NAGOYA FOWL WITH
 SPECIAL REFERENCE TO SEXLINKAGE AND NOTICE IN BREEDING PRACTICE. Poultry Sci. 36:
 378-383.
- (157) Scheinberg, S. L., Ward, H., and Nordskog, A. W.
 1953. Breeding for egg quality. 1.
 Heritability and repeatability of egg weight and
 its components. Poultry Sci.
 32: 504-510.
- (158) SCHULTZ, F. T.
 1953. ANALYSIS OF EGG SHAPE OF
 CHICKENS. Biometrics 9: 336353.
- (159) SHAKLEE, W. E., and Knox, C. W.
 1956. SELECTION FOR THYROID WEIGHT
 IN NEW HAMPSHIRE CHICKENS.
 Jour. Hered. 47: 211-212.
- (160) Sheldon, B. L.
 1956. Genetic parameters associated with characters affecting egg production in the domestic fowl. 1. Heritability of total egg production during the pullet year. Austral. Jour. Agr. Res. 7: 625-629.
- (161) Shibata, K.
 1965. Genetic correlations among some economic traits in a white leghorn closed flock.
 Jour. Agr. Sci. (Tokyo) 2: 18.
- (162) Shoffner, R. N., and Sloan, H. J. 1948. Heritability studies in the do-Mestic fowl. VIII World's Poultry Cong. Proc., pp. 269-281.
- (163) SIEGEL, P. B.
 1960. A METHOD FOR EVALUATING AGGRESSIVENESS IN CHICKENS.
 Poultry Sci. 39: 1046-1048.
- (164)

 1962. A DOUBLE SELECTION EXPERIMENT
 FOR BODY WEIGHT AND BREAST
 ANGLE AT EIGHT WEEKS OF AGE
 IN CHICKENS. Genetics 47:
 1313-1319.

- (166)

 1962. SELECTION FOR BREAST ANGLE AT
 EIGHT WEEKS OF AGE. 1. GENE
 INTERACTIONS AND HERITABILITIES. Poultry Sci. 41: 1177–
 1185.
- (167)

 1963. SELECTION FOR BREAST ANGLE AT
 EIGHT WEEKS OF AGE. 2. CORRELATED RESPONSES OF FEATHERING BODY WEIGHTS AND REPRODUCTIVE CHARACTERS. Poultry
 Sci. 42: 437-449.
- (168)

 1963. SELECTION FOR BODY WEIGHT AT
 EIGHT WEEKS OF AGE. 2. CORRELATED RESPONSES OF FEATHERING, BODY WEIGHTS AND REPRODUCTIVE CHARACTERISTICS. Poultry Sci. 42: 896-905.
- (170) —— Craig, J. V., and Mueller, C. D.
 1957. Heritabilities, sex differences
 AND PHENOTYPIC CORRELATIONS
 FOR SIX FEATHERING CHARACTERISTICS. Poultry Sci. 36:
 621-628.
- (171) —— and Essary, E. O.
 1959. HERITABILITIES AND INTERRELATIONSHIPS OF LIVE MEASUREMENTS AND EVISCERATED WEIGHT
 IN BROILERS. Poultry Sci. 38:
 530-532.
- (172) —— and Siegel, H. S.

 1960. Genetic parameters of gland
 AND BODY WEIGHTS IN WHITE
 ROCK COCKERELS. Jour. Hered.
 51: 59-62.
- (173) —— and Siegel, H. S.

 1963. THE CORRELATED RESPONSES OF
 RELATIVE AGGRESSIVENESS TO
 SELECTION FOR BODY WEIGHT
 AND BREAST ANGLE IN CHICKENS.
 Poultry Sci. 42: 1208-1211.
- (174) —— and Siegel, H. S.
 1964. GENETIC VARIATION IN CHICK BIOASSAYS FOR GONADOTROPINS. 1.
 TESTES WEIGHT AND RESPONSE.
 Va. Jour. Sci. 15: 187.

SMITH, F. V., and TEMPLETON, W. B. (175)1965. GENETIC ASPECTS OF THE RESPONSE OF THE DOMESTIC CHICK TO Anim. Be-VISUAL STIMULI. haviour 14: 291–295.

(176)SMITH, J. H., AND JAAP, R. G.

1957. NON-ADDITIVE GENETIC EFFECTS ON GROWTH IN A FLOCK CLOSED FROM CROSSBRED PARENTS. (Abstract) Poultry Sci. 36: 1158.

(177)Soller, M., Snaper, N., and Schindler, Η.

1965.HERITABILITY OF SEMEN QUANTITY, CONCENTRATION AND MOTILITY IN WHITE ROCK ROOSTERS AND THEIR GENETIC CORRELATION WITH RATE OF GAIN. Poultry

Sci. 44: 1527-1529. Stahl, P., Pipes, G. W., Turner, C. W., (178)and Stephenson, A. B.

1962.MODE OF INHERITANCE OF THY-ROXINE SECRETION RATE IN LINES OF NEW HAMPSHIRE CHICK-ENS. Poultry Sci. 41: 570-572.

(179)STONE, H. A., and Collins, W. M. 1966. HERITABILITY OF BLOOD CAROTI-NOID CONCENTRATION AND ITS GENETIC RELATIONSHIP TO BODY WEIGHT IN THE CHICKEN. (Abstract) Poultry Sci. 45: 1128.

STURKIE, P. D., WEISS, H. S., RINGER, (180)R. K., and Sheahan, M. M. 1959. HERITABILITY OF BLOOD PRESSURE in chickens. Poultry Sci. 38:

333-337. STUTS, E. C., BRILES, W. E., and KUN-(181)KEL, H. O.

1957. PLASMA ALKALINE PHOSPHATASE ACTIVITY IN MATURE INBRED CHICKENS. Poultry Sci. 36: 269–276.

TABER, R. W., McClung, M. R., and (182)HYRE, H. M. 1967. HERITABILITY OF INTERVAL BE-

TWEEN OVIPOSITION IN THE HEN. (Abstract) Poultry Sci. 46: 1326.

(183)THOMAS, C. H., BLOW, W. L., COCKER-HAM, C. C., and GLAZENER, E. W. HERITABILITY 1958. THE \mathbf{OF} WEIGHT, GAIN, CONSUMPTION AND FEED CONVERSION IN BROIL-ERS. Poultry Sci. 37: 862-869.

(184)Torges, H. G. 1963.

INVESTIGATIONS ON THE DEGREE OF INHERITANCE IN EGG QUALITY CHARACTERS, EGG ALBUMEN IN-DEX, BREAKING STRENGTH OF THE SHELL AND YOLK COLOUR. (Abstract) Anim. Breeding Abs. 32: 2457.

VAN VLECK, L. D., and Doolittle, D. P. (185)1964. GENETIC PARAMETERS OF MONTHLY EGG PRODUCTION IN THE COR-NELL CONTROLS. Poultry Sci. 43: 560-567.

- King, S. C., and Doolittle, D. P. (186)1963. SOURCES OF VARIATION IN THE CORNELL CONTROLS AT TWO LOCATIONS. Poultry Sci. 42: 1114-1125.

WARING, F. J., HUNTON, P., and MADDI-(187)son, A. E.

1962. GENETICS OF A CLOSED POULTRY FLOCK. 1. VARIANCE AND CO-VARIANCE ANALYSIS OF EGG PRO-DUCTION, EGG WEIGHT AND EGG MASS. Brit. Poultry Sci. 3: 151-160.

(188)WASHBURN, K. W. 1967. HERITABILITY OF PACKED

BLOOD CELL VOLUME IN THE DOMESTIC FOWL. Poultry Sci.

RED

46: 1025–1026.

—— and Siegel, P. B. (189)1963. INFLUENCE OF THIOURACIL ON

CHICKENS SELECTED FOR HIGH AND LOW BODY WEIGHTS. Poultry Sci. 42: 161–169.

(190)WHEAT, J. D., and Lush, J. L.

1961. ACCURACY OF PARTIAL TRAPNEST RECORDS. 2. RATES OF LAY FOR SPECIFIC PERIODS OF THE YEAR AND HERITABILITY OF YEARLY PRODUCTION. Poultry Sci. 40: 402-406.

(191)WILCOX, F. H., CHERMS, F. L., JR., VAN VLECK, L. D., and others.

1963. ESTIMATES OF GENETIC PARAM-ETERS OF SERUM CHOLESTEROL LEVEL. Poultry Sci. 42: 37-42.

(192)- Van Vleck, L. D., and Shoffner, C. S.

1962. SERUM ALKALINE PHOSPHATASE AND EGG PRODUCTION. X World's Poultry Cong. Proc., pp. 19–21.

(193)WILSON, H. R., ARMAS, A. E., Ross, I. J., and others.

1966. FAMILIAL DIFFERENCES OF SINGLE COMB WHITE LEGHORN CHICK-ENS IN TOLERANCE TO HIGH AMBIENT TEMPERATURE. Poultry Sci. 45: 784–788.

(194)Wilson, W. O.

1948. EGG PRODUCTION RATE AND FERTILITY IN INBRED CHICK-ENS. Poultry Sci. 27: 719–726.

(195)1948. VIABILITY OF EMBRYOS OF CHICKS in inbred chickens. Poultry Sci. 27: 727-735.

- (196) Wood, B. M., and Garren, H. W.
 1958. A STUDY OF THE RESISTANCE OF
 RHODE ISLAND REDS TO IMPLANTS OF LYMPHOID TUMOR
 STRAIN RPL-12. Poultry Sci.
 37: 321-326.
- (197) Wyatt, A. J.
 1954. Genetic variation and covariation in egg production and other economic traits in chickens. Poultry Sci. 33: 1266-1274.
- (198) Yamada, Y., Bohren, B. B., and Crittenden, L. B.
 1958. Genetic analysis of a white leghorn closed flock apparently plateaued for egg production. Poultry Sci. 37: 565–580.

(199) Yao, K. T. S.
1958. EGG INTERIOR QUALITY OF PURE-BRED, INBRED, INCROSS AND INCROSS-BRED CHICKENS. (Abstract) Poultry Sci. 37: 1254.

(200) —— and Skinner, J. L.

1959. HERITABILITY AND GENETIC CORRELATIONS OF ALBUMEN WEIGHT
AND YOLK SIZE IN CHICKEN EGGS.
(Abstract) Poultry Sci. 38: 1262.

(201) Zervas, N. P., and Collins, W. M.
1965. Genetic variation in 14-day
CHICK EMBRYO WEIGHT. Poultry Sci. 44: 631-636.

(202) —— Collins, W. M., and Skoglund, W. C.

1962. GENETIC VARIATION AND COVARIATION IN YELLOW SHANK PIGMENTATION INTENSITY AND EIGHTWEEK BODY WEIGHT OF CHICKENS. Poultry Sci. 41: 1247-1254.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

- (203) Andrews, L. D.

 1966. RECURRENT SELECTION AND GENETIC PARAMETERS OF ECONOMIC IMPORTANCE IN THE DOMESTIC FOWL. Unpublished Ph. D. thesis. Copy on file, Univ. of Mo. Libr., Columbia.
- (204) Arze, G. C.

 1964. Selection for mating ability
 AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO FERTILITY IN THE DOMESTIC FOWL.
 M.S. thesis. Copy on file, Univ.
 of Ga. Libr., Athens.
- (205) HAWKES, B. W.

 1963. GENETIC PARAMETERS OF QUANTITATIVE CHARACTERISTICS IN DIVERGENT LINES OF CHICKENS.

 M.S. thesis. Copy on file, Va.
 Polytech. Inst. Libr., Blacksburg.

- (206) LANKFORD, L. T.
 - 1952. HERITABILITY OF GROWTH RATE IN WHITE WYANDOTTE CHICKENS.
 M.S. thesis. Copy on file, Univ. of Ark. Libr., Fayetteville.
- (207) SAADEH, H. K. 1967. RECIPROCAL

1967. RECIPROCAL RECURRENT SELECTION VERSUS FAMILY INDEX SELECTION, HERITABILITIES AND CORRELATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH QUANTITATIVE TRAITS IN THE DOMESTIC FOWL. Unpublished Ph. D. thesis. Copy on file, Kans. State Univ. Libr., Manhattan.